

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD

A
MONTHLY
JOURNAL
UNDER
EPISCOPAL
SANCTION

*Reprinted by
St. Bernard's
et. Roman Catholic
Rev. S. Patrick
in L.A. Area*

OCTOBER
1917

80th Year
No. 393

Fifth Series
Vol. X

FINEST TEAS

We buy all our Teas by competition, and thus secure the finest quality.
We therefore offer THE PICK OF THE MARKET at the following prices:-

3/-, 2/10, 2/8, 2/6.

BECKER BROTHERS, Ltd., Tea Dealers and Importers,
5 South Great George's St.: 17 North Earl St., DUBLIN.
Telephone 191.

The following are the titles of the books in the series:-

The Battlefields of Ypres.

This historic ground, the scene of numerous episodes in the grand world struggle, was in days long past the scene of some of the most famous actions of the Irish Brigades. The stirring story of these events and more will be in thrilling character may be read in detail in the first volume of this fine historical and biographical work.

The Irish Dames of Ypres:

Being a history of the Irish Nurses who served in Belgium from 1880 and also describing the work of the Irish Dames in the Ypres area. With a portrait of the first and last of the Irish nursing companies. With numerous illustrations. Popular Edition 12s. net. 10s. 6d. by post.

By Mrs.

REV. DOM PATRICK NOLAN,

Canon and Rector of the Cathedral of St. Patrick, Dublin.

BROWNE & NOLAN, LTD., Publishers, MANSON STREET, DUBLIN.

**Vacuum Cleaners, Carpet Sweepers, Hoil and Fibre
Sweeping Brushes, Yard Brooms, Toilet Brushes,
Curtain Drawers, Sewing Machines.**

We have a large stock of all household appliances,
and our expert staff can advise you on the best to purchase.

GLEESON, O'DEA & Co., Ltd.,

TELEPHONE:
DUBLIN 267.

Christchurch Place, DUBLIN.

THE IRISH Ecclesiastical Record

A Monthly Journal under Episcopal Sanction

Nihil Obstat :

TERENTIUS O'DONNELL, S.T.D.
Censor Dep.

Imprimi potest :

✠ GULIELMUS,
Archiep. Dublin.,
Hiberniae Primas.

CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER, 1917

	PAGE
PHILOSOPHY AND THE WAR	265
By REV. W. H. POLLARD, B.A., Rugby, England	
THE ALLEGED SOURCES OF GENESIS I-III	278
By REV. C. LATTEY, S.J., St. Asaph, N. Wales	
THE JOURNALS OF THE IRISH PARLIAMENT	289
By MICHAEL MACDONAGH, London	
TO-DAY AND THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD	302
By REV. E. STEPHENS, Durham, England	
NOTES AND QUERIES	
Theology—By REV. M. J. O'DONNELL, D.D., Maynooth College :	
The New Regulations on Preaching	313
Transference of Mass Honoraria	317
Canon Law—By REV. J. KINANE, D.C.L., Maynooth College :	
Law of Preaching peculiar to certain Dioceses—Nature of the Obligation it Imposes	319
Study during the Novitiate	320
Selecting Deputies for General Chapters	321
A Will Case	322
An Interpretation of the Decree ' Cum de Sacramentalibus '	324
Liturgy—By REV. T. O'DOHERTY, Maynooth College :	
Calendar to be followed in certain Institutions	325
Light before the Blessed Sacrament in a Private House	326
Tabernacle Veil	327

(Contents continued overleaf.)

CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER—Contd.

Liturgy—Contd.	PAGE
Historical Lessons of the Feast of St. Eunan	328
Exsequial Mass 'pro paupere defuncto'—The Irish Privilege of Celebrating a Low Exsequial Mass 'ob inopiam sacerdotum'	328
DOCUMENTS	
Encyclical Letter of the Holy Father on the Preaching of the Word of God	329
Rules for Preaching in accordance with the Encyclical, prescribed by the Sacred Consistorial Congregation	336
The Teaching and Explanation of the new Code of Canon Law	342
Certain Canons of the new Code to take effect Immediately	343
The Catholic Truth Society of Ireland is granted many Indulgences and Privileges	347
REVIEWS AND NOTES	
'Science et Apologétique'	350
'The Stations of the Cross'	352

ANNOUNCEMENTS

EDITORIAL

Articles for submission to Editor, Queries, Correspondence, and Books for Review, to be sent to The Editor, 'Irish Ecclesiastical Record,' St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.

SUBSCRIPTIONS—Home and Foreign

The 'Irish Ecclesiastical Record' can be supplied direct from the publishers for 12/- per annum (\$3), post free to all parts of the world. Cheques and Post Office Orders to be made payable to the publishers, Browne and Nolan, Limited, Nassau Street, Dublin. Changes of address by subscribers should also be sent to the publishers.

ADVERTISEMENTS

New copy for advertisements, alterations, etc., should be sent to the publishers not later than the morning of the 15th of the month preceding that in which such changes are required to be made.

BINDING SUBSCRIBERS' COPIES

Cloth cases for half-yearly volumes are supplied by the publishers for 1/3 each. They will supply cases and bind subscribers' numbers therein for 2/- per half-yearly volume.

Offices of the 'Irish Ecclesiastical Record':
Nassau Street, Dublin.

BROWNE & NOLAN, LIMITED, Publishers and Printers.

Now Ready, 12 parts in 1 Vol. Cloth, 1/6, net; per post, 1/9

SONGS OF THE GAEL

A Collection of Anglo-Irish Songs and Ballads

∴ Wedded to Old Traditional Irish Airs ∴

BY

AN T-ÁDAIR PÁDÚRÚIS BREATHAC

EDITOR OF "Fúinn na smól"

BROWNE & NOLAN, LIMITED DUBLIN

AND ALL BOOKSELLERS

Why Send Away?

Why not support IRISH Industry?

????? !!!!!



☞ We will be most happy to send post free descriptive Lists of the following:—

**Flower Seeds, Vegetable Seeds,
Plants, Trees, Shrubs.**

**Garden Tools, Manures, Insecticides, Wheelbarrows, Arches,
Seats, etc., etc.**

Wm. POWER & Co., Seed Merchants, **Waterford**
and Nurserymen

Phone 100.

Wires "Seedmerchants."

When ordering please mention this Journal

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN
(A CONSTITUENT COLLEGE OF THE NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND).

SESSION 1917-18.

The following Regulations for the College Courses, etc., may be obtained on application:—

1. GENERAL REGULATIONS—SCHOLARSHIPS, FEES, ETC.
2. COURSES FOR DEGREES IN ARTS, PHILOSOPHY, and CELTIC STUDIES.
3. COURSES FOR DEGREES IN SCIENCE.
4. COURSES FOR DEGREES IN LAW.
5. COURSES FOR DEGREES IN MEDICINE (INCLUDING DENTISTRY).
6. COURSES FOR DEGREES IN ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECTURE.
7. COURSES FOR DEGREES IN COMMERCE.

ENTRANCE SCHOLARSHIPS EXAMINATIONS—October 2nd, 1917.

INTRODUCTORY COURSE IN MEDICINE AND SCHOLARSHIP EXAMINATIONS IN MEDICINE—October 2nd, 1917.

LECTURES IN ARTS, SCIENCE, MEDICINE, DENTISTRY, ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECTURE AND COMMERCE—October 9th, 1917.

LECTURES IN LAW BEGIN—October 25th, 1917.

Apply to the College, 86 St. Stephen's Green, or the School of Medicine, Cecilia Street, or by letter addressed to the Registrar, University College, Dublin.

JOHN SMYTH & SONS, ESTABLISHED 1840.

17 WICKLOW STREET, DUBLIN.

WORKS—1, 2, 3, 4 WICKLOW LANE.

Manufacturers of Chalice, Ciboriums, Monstrances, Thuribles, and Incense Boats, Brass Candlesticks, Branches, Brackets, Elevation Lights, Votive Candelabra, Gongs, Chimes, Missal-stands, Vases, Memorial Brasses, and every article of Ecclesiastical Art Metal Work.

REPAIRING, REPLATING, AND REGILDING OF SACRED VESSELS.

Restoring, Polishing, and Lacquering Brasswork a Speciality.

Special Designs made free of Charge, and Architects' Drawings estimated for.

PRICES MODERATE. WRITE FOR ILLUSTRATED QUOTATIONS. CATALOGUE FREE.

ESTABLISHED 1824.

Thomas,
William
AND
John

Kelly, Dublin.

89, LOWER GARDINER STREET,

Offices: 1 & 2, WESTMORELAND STREET, DUBLIN

(Next Bank of Ireland),

We respectfully solicit from the HIERARCHY and CLERGY a continuance of their valued patronage for the

Pure Altar Wine,

Imported by us for the use of the Altar, which we have for three generations supplied throughout Ireland, England, and the Colonies.

Price per dozen (Bottles and Carriage included) on application.
2/- per dozen allowed for Altar Wine Bottles when returned in good condition, carriage paid.

In other **Wines** we hold a large and well-assorted stock, together with the finest **Spirits**, both home and foreign. Lists on application.

As advertisements frequently appear which are likely to confuse our names with those of other firms, intending purchasers should make inquiries as to the addresses and identity of the firms with whom they are dealing.

1st March, 1917.

When ordering please mention this Journal



Matthew O'Byrne,

Bell Founder,

JAMES'S STREET, DUBLIN

Church Bells, Peals, and Chimes.

For sweetness of tone and musical qualities our bells cannot be surpassed. They are to be heard ringing in Europe, Asia, Africa, America, and Australasia. Our rotary iron mountings make the bell easy to ring, preserve its true tone and prevent it from getting cracked.

Catalogue and estimate on application.

Kennedy's Bread

Finest Quality Made.

Bakeries:

124 TO 130 Great Britain St.)

AND

St. Patrick's Bakery

Dublin

AN ALARMING WATCH

NOT a toy, but a most reliable timekeeper. Can be set like an alarm clock. Rings loudly. Luminous hands and figures. The ideal Clerical Watch.

Excellent value at **4** gns.

Ganter Brothers,

68 SOUTH GREAT GEORGE'S STREET, DUBLIN.

Gold Expanding Watch Bracelets

**GOLD, SILVER, AND OXIDIZED
WRIST WATCHES, Mounted on
Leather Straps.**

**CLOCKS, JEWELLERY, SILVER
:: AND ELECTRO-PLATE, &c. ::**

Frengley Bros., Ltd.

5 Crow Street (off Dame St.) DUBLIN.

When ordering please mention this Journal

"The first and best safeguard that our Schcols can give is to create in every scholar an aptitude and liking for the work by which he is to live."—LE BLANC.



kind attention of
Rev. Managers of
National Schools
is respectfully directed to
the following New Reading
Books devoted to the ::

Interests and activities of the countryside, and representing the most promising development in Irish Rural Education that has been seen in our time:—

Browne & Nolan's Rural Readers

JUNIOR BOOK (for Standards III. & IV.)
SENIOR BOOK (for Standards V. to VII.)



BROWNE & NOLAN, LTD., PUBLISHERS,
DUBLIN • BELFAST • CORK • WATERFORD

When ordering please mention this Journal

Irish Catholic Church Property Insurance Co., Ltd.

19 & 20 FLEET STREET, DUBLIN.

DIRECTORS.

THOMAS SEXTON, Esq.

VERY REV. JAMES DONNELLAN, D.D.

WILLIAM McCORMICK, Esq., J.P.

JOHN L. SCALLAN, Esq.

Policies of Insurance are issued by the Company at ordinary rates, upon Churches, Convents, Colleges, Schools, Residences, and all other Institutions and Buildings devoted to Catholic purposes, as well as on the personal property of Catholic Ecclesiastics,

Fire Insurance

Employers' Liability Insurance

AND
against the liability of Employers to pay compensation for personal injury by accident to their Employees.

Forms and full particulars on application to

VALENTINE IRWIN, SECRETARY.

STUDIES

An Irish Quarterly Review of Letters, Philosophy and Science

SEPTEMBER

CONTENTS

1917

- I.—THE PEOPLE, THE STATE, AND THE DRINK PROBLEM. By Rev. Professor Peter Coffey, D.Ph.
- II.—PÉGU Y AND HIS CIRCLE. By Virginia M. Crawford.
- III.—A RELIC OF CANON SHEEHAN. By Rev. Professor George O'Neill, S.J., M.A.
- IV.—ANCIENT BABYLON. By Rev. Professor Patrick Boylan, M.A.
- V.—WILLIAM REDMOND : SOME PERSONAL MEMORIES. By John J. Horgan.
- VI.—FAITH AND FACTS. By Professor Alfred Rahilly, M.A., B.Sc.
- VII.—POETRY—THE OLD WAY. By Katharine Tynan.
GLADIUS DOMINI. By G. M. Hort.
THE NUN. By Cathaoir O'Braonain.
THE JUDGE. By George Noble Plunkett.
- VIII.—THE TUBERCULOSIS PROBLEM. By William M. Crofton, M.D.
- IX.—ENGLISH LITERATURE IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS. By Peter McBrien.
- X.—NEW INDUSTRIES FOR A GREATER CORK. By J. L. Fawsitt.
- XI.—CHRONICLE—I. GAELIC COLLEGES. By Professor Arthur E. Clery, LL.D.
II. NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY. By James J. Walsh, M.D., Ph.D., Sc.D.
- XII.—REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

N.B.—"Studies" enjoys the distinction, unique amongst high-class Reviews in the United Kingdom, of having quadrupled its circulation since the war began. Every issue marks an increase.

PRICE (United Kingdom) : 2s. 6d. net ; Annual Subscription, 10s. post free.
(Foreign Countries) : 3s. net 12s. post free.
Postage on Single Copies, 4d.

Dublin : The Educational Company of Ireland, Limited.
London and St. Louis : B. Herder. Melbourne : William P. Linehan.

When ordering please mention this Journal

ASK FOR . . .

IRISH ALTAR WAX CANDLES



Guaranteed and Stamped
75%, 65% & 25% Genuine Beeswax.
SANCTIONED BY THE HIERARCHY.

IRISH BLEACHED BEESWAX.

Manufactured
by . .

JOHN G. RATHBORNE, Ltd.

[Established
A.D. 1488.]

**Candle Manufacturers,
Oil Refiners, Wax Bleachers, &c.**

Phoenix Candle Works and 203 Parnell Street, **DUBLIN.**

THE IRISH ROSARY

The October number is an
exceptionally interesting one

BUY IT!
Price Fourpence

THE IRISH ROSARY

When ordering please mention this Journal

Irish-made Church Plate and Ecclesiastical Art Metal Work



Chalices

Monstrances

Thurible and Boat

Candelabra for Benediction

Votive Shrines

Candlesticks

Gongs

Altar Cruets

Ciboria

Thrones

Processional Crosses

Sanctuary Lamps

Vases

Holy Water Vats

Pyxes, Oil Stocks, &c.

Made in our Factory—6 MAYLOR STREET, CORK.

*Irish Poplin & Cloth of Gold Vestments, Irish Altar
Linens, Albs, Surplices, &c., Plain & Embroidered,*

All made on the Premises.

ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUE POST FREE.

WM. EGAN & SONS, LTD. 32 Patrick St.
CORK.

When ordering please mention this Journal

IRISH POPLIN VESTMENTS

It is well worth while to specify **ELLIOTT'S IRISH POPLIN** when ordering Vestments, Copes, Robes, Banners, etc., as it is an ideal fabric for such purposes—combining a rich and elegant appearance with extraordinary durability. It can be supplied by all Vestment Makers, in plain cord, moire, and figured in Ecclesiastical and Celtic designs. Should any difficulty be experienced, please write direct for patterns to

THOMAS ELLIOTT & SONS, Irish Poplin and Silk Manufacturers,
25 BROWN STREET, WEAVERS' SQUARE :: DUBLIN.

FITS CURED.

FITS, EPILEPSY, &c., can be cured. Nothing can disprove it—in face of the thousands cured by

TRENCH'S REMEDY.

Write at once for Pamphlet containing
CONVINCING TESTIMONY
from sufferers, their friends, and
their clergy.

TRENCH'S REMEDY for Epilepsy
is famous the world over.

Simple Home Treatment.

TRENCH'S REMEDIES, Ltd., Dept. R, 33 South Frederick-st., Dublin.

Agencies Abroad: Union Mantg. Co., 299, Elizabeth St., Melbourne; Ellison & Duncan, Port Ahuriri, Napier, New Zealand; Grocott & Sherry, Grahams-town, East London, and Johannesburg; Stranack & Williams, 320, West St., Durban; for U.S.A. and Canada; Trench's Remedies, Ltd., 107 St. James Chambers, Toronto; Messrs. Tothill, Sharp & Co., Tamarind Lane, Fort, Bombay; Mr. A. G. Humphreys, Casilla de Correo 675, Buenos Aires.

OVER 1000 TESTIMONIALS IN ONE YEAR.

FLOORS

**In Marble Terrazzo, Tiles, Vitreous Mosaic
Wood Blocks, Durolith Jointless Floors,
Fireproof Reinforced Concrete.**

Ask for Estimates, please.

O'HARA & EGAN,

Telegrams—
"Haregan, Dublin."

LINCOLN PLACE, DUBLIN.

Telephone 2614.

PURE MEDICINES.

**SKILFUL AND RELIABLE DISPENSING
AT MODERATE TERMS.**

The quality of all Medicine supplied is freely recognised by the Leading Members of the Medical Profession; as also is the prompt and reliable attention given to all orders.

Medical, Sick Room, and Toilet Requisites of the Highest Class.

Tel. 899. **PRICE'S MEDICAL HALL, Ltd.,**

(Established 50 years.)

26 Clare Street, Dublin.

When ordering please mention this Journal

PHILOSOPHY AND THE WAR

BY REV. W. H. POLLARD, B.A.

IT is no hard thing to a Catholic to admit that philosophy, true or false, must in the end have a profound influence on practical life. The mass of men, however, do not dream of such a thing. If they glance at philosophy at all they only become the more impressed with the immense distance which separates it from their own busy lives. They catch glimpses of a few harmless dim-eyed old men, morbidly given to abstraction and left becalmed in a quiet backwater of life, while the eager flood goes by regardless. The man of pure science, they see, finds out truths which are afterwards turned to account by others; but they are much less prepared to believe that any close relations exist between philosophy and practice. Nor is this reluctance surprising. There seems to be an inbred human instinct of repugnance to any attempt to lift the veil of Nature and so come to close quarters with the empirical or 'common-sense' view of the primary facts of life. Another reason may be found in the ridiculous figure that so many philosophers have made in all ages, with their *odium philosophicum* and their incapacity to understand each other's meaning. But is it not largely also through an unworthy contempt of mere theory, at least when theory has no obvious material advantage to offer by way of a bribe? Men dislike abstract thinking; it gives them the headache. Consequently, they easily conclude that it is of no use.

It must be owned that the word 'philosophy' is a badly damaged one after centuries of rough handling. Here we may simply define it as the study of first principles; meaning by that the very first principles of all, not those that are only relatively first, for instance, the fundamental truths of chemistry. Clearly the distance between first principles rightly so called and their practical applications must be for the most part immensely long. The philosopher is not often very successful as a statesman or as a

leader in social reform. Minds quite untrained in philosophical thought are found far more helpful in such matters ; and that is natural. The fact is that the workings of a healthy mind are founded on an *implicit* acceptance of true first principles. The multitude, if only false theory would let them alone, have right instincts ; and, though these are continually being nullified by men's passions, they remain very powerful as a whole. But when we begin to reflect and form theories and try to squeeze the facts of life into the rigid frames of those theories, we gravely lessen thereby (at any rate, if the theories are false) the activity of our rational instincts. Unfortunately, the reflex thought which now succeeds to the command is infinitely more fallible than the promptings it has displaced. A defective philosophy, to the undisguised amusement of all intelligent non-philosophers, notoriously renders its victim almost incapable of viewing the universe with a truly candid mind. Wherever he looks he sees his precious system—

'Tis the blot upon the brain
That will show itself without—

and these strictures must be applicable even to a true system, since it is sure to be only partial at best. Philosophers would not be the best masters of the Republic after all.

But a prudent mistrust of philosophers when they pass out of their province is easily distorted into something very different. It can turn into the average Englishman's attitude towards them, an attitude purely empirical. In this country we have slowly accumulated a hoard of practical experience in political and social questions, and a tradition has formed itself of sober and shrewd action on the basis of that experience ; and that action has the stamp of success on it, and success confirms the maxims by which it is guided. But the principles, the living root of all this, seem to our minds wholly remote from the ends we have in view, and they therefore remain unthought-out. We simply shrink from first principles, we abhor them ; we suspect them as something occult and remote.

And yet all the while there is a living nexus between headquarters and the furthest outpost, between great principles and the last petty application of them. It is the relation of a seed to a plant. The whole plant springs

from its seed, even though the popular eye cannot drill down to the roots and recognize there that which implicitly contained the whole. And that is why the leading philosophers of a country are really important persons ; and their teaching, which seems circumscribed by the narrow walls of lecture-rooms which very few students frequent, or enclosed in volumes read by a very minute public, is, in fact, exceedingly self-diffusive and hard to control. As soon as propounded, it begins to filter subtly into the whole body politic and social. There is quite a series of agents ; first, the manufacturers, then the distributors, the retail dealers, and finally the widespread consumers of philosophic doctrines. These do not, of course, reach the consumer in philosophic form, but he swallows them worked up into a tasty compound, in which the other ingredients disguise from him the grave step he is taking. In short, the evils of our time have their root in a lying philosophy which pretends to go down to first principles and does not.

It is evident that a true philosophy will give us the key, not merely of many things, but in some sense of all things. That is, it will show us that all things form a coherent system, and that they rest ultimately on something which the mind in its very first act knows to be the truth. The investigation may begin with the gathering of particular facts and the sorting of them into groups. We should thus arrive at certain general truths which relatively to their own departments were first principles. The next step would be to find the common element in them. As the process of broadening the principles goes forward, their number grows less and less, and we begin indistinctly to see our system as a sort of inverted but not unstable cone. At length one general principle is arrived at which enters into all things and lays the foundation of all ; and such a first principle every philosophy promises us. You cannot go deeper than that. It must be such that of necessity you cannot go deeper ; that is to say, it must contain its own proof, its *ratio*. If it is not self-evident and all-containing it is not a philosophical basis, but a *cul de sac* ; and not only the blind leaders but the multitude of dupes who follow will soon find themselves at a hopeless standstill, most likely in the ditch.

Naturally enough, it is in the later and decaying stages of society that false philosophies have their strongest influence. In its earlier and healthier periods the machinery

of life was so much less complicated. There was little danger of error here; but with each forward step of reflection the risks of self-deception grow alarmingly. Sometimes it is honest dullness, sometimes blinding warping passion, that perverts the theories in the making, and renders them, not clearer views of the first known truths, but laboured excuses for a denial of them. Thus false first principles are forged; and just because they are not clear dry truth, but apologies for popular error, they are welcomed, and quickly begin to run through society, to create false consciences everywhere, and overwhelm simple truth under a mountain of special pleading. An historical instance will make the bearings of this clearer.

The volcanic outburst of the French Revolution had been prepared, like all other eruptions, by slow accumulations underground. But no one can think that the sufferings of the poor and either the high-handedness or the embarrassments of the Government would have brought about such an overthrow by themselves, if it had not been for new systems of thought which had been imperceptibly but most radically affecting the minds of many. One must have recourse to some widespread change of first principles to explain why abuses, which in many ages are either tolerated or peacefully reformed, are in another suddenly swept away, or rather exchanged for others, by a wild outbreak of violence and blood. It is, therefore, only at first sight that it will seem extravagant to trace the Revolution to the sensistic theories of the school of Locke. Locke, in England in the seventeenth century, writing with philosophic calmness, lays it down that all ideas are drawn from sensation alone. First we feel, and then we reflect on our feeling. The general truths that we come to recognize are simply drawn from the sensations. How the sensations, which are particulars, can contain in themselves universal truths he does not and cannot explain; but he says we can get the truths from nowhere else. The theory was soon popularized in France. In Britain Hume drew the reasonable inference that universals extracted from things that cannot contain them have no validity. In other words sensism naturally produces universal scepticism. The British public did not mind all this, but again it gained greedy hearers in France; and we know how profoundly it was leavening the public mind and obscuring the value of truth and the dignity of man and

the authority of the moral law when the political excitements of 1789 gave it its popularity.

When such a philosophy is translated into practical activity it undergoes a startling change of appearance. A bookish thinker first put it together, tentatively, coldly ; and his temperament left him unconcerned with the possible effect of his theories on masses of men. To him the theoretical was keenly interesting ; but the practical was a quite different world in which he went through certain dull routines with much indifference. He never thought of combining the two. He probably knew that the theories could not really bear that test in actual conditions. But to the multitude on whom they gradually dawned and to whom they came as decrees of emancipation they spoke very differently. The crowd were more logical than the philosophers in this case, and they followed their theory out remorselessly to the full length of its implications. It was an easy step from Locke's impossible creature of sense and reflection, and from Hume's walking contradiction who doubted everything, to political theories like Rousseau's, which invest the State with omnipotence and minorities with no rights at all, and to that doctrine of equality which more than any other seems naturally to lead to general servitude.

Sensism is, of course, not a philosophy in any complete sense, for it has no first principle. Its principle is not a first, but involves a deeper question, which is never answered. One could draw from it a great number of fine sentiments—they are just the crop such a soil would favour—a pleasant sense of comradeship or brotherhood, for instance ; whence sprang, in its time, the spirit which marks the governments of the nineteenth century, all coloured more or less with the effects of that great upheaval. Man's material well-being was sought by many of them with praiseworthy vigour, but his noblest interests were too often either derided and starved or left unheeded as matters so unimportant and doubtful that an enlightened State could not cumber itself with providing for them. And thus it is that false philosophies tend to undermine themselves.

We see, then, that the influence of speculative thought upon the world's doings is no new thing. It has turned the whole stream of life from one channel to another in the past, and it may do so again. Surely, it is turning it now.

Surely that monstrous growth of evils in which our age is so luxuriant has also its basis in false systems of philosophy which have taken a step from the sensism of the eighteenth century to the no less deadly subjectivism of the nineteenth. The systems of this period have been many and often contradictory of each other, but on the whole they have had a prevalent spirit; and that spirit has been the very motive-power which is hurrying onwards the disintegration of civilized society. Again, it is undermining itself; and Nature's own homœopathic treatment is making of the appalling evils of the day the very remedy, the violent and desperate dose, which alone can save us. We cannot pretend here to analyse any single scheme in illustration of our thesis; but a brief glance at subjectivist philosophy in general may help in the detection of its subtle poison.

Subjects and objects are nowadays spoken of so vaguely, even by people who pass for philosophers, that one wishes it were possible to withdraw the two words altogether from popular speech. In this paper at any rate the subject is the soul itself, intelligent and sentient, acting or acted upon; the object is that which is wholly external to the subject, but stands before him and is immediately apprehended by him. By a subjectivist philosophy we mean, therefore, one in which even that which seems wholly external to the subject is attributed to that subject. It is difficult to describe this standpoint without seeming to travesty it. Its lure, however, has been dreadfully powerful in all ages, doubtless through the egotism which debilitates man's nature. Nothing else could recommend so irrational a doctrine.

Some philosophers have been unconsciously subjectivist. The sense, they explained, perceived external things in their particularity; the understanding perceived their common element only. Each in its own way was a power of feeling, for the intelligence had a sort of sense of this common element—that is, of the primary ideas. But ideas have no life of their own; they only exist as seen by the mind. Where, then, does it get them from? They are abstracted, say these theorists, from the sensations. But they are not in the sensations. The particular, the feeling, is quite unable to contain in itself the common, which is a relation of the feeling with something of quite a different nature. Is the common element, then, in the

mind itself? No, they say, there are no ideas innate in the mind; they are drawn from the senses only. As water takes the shape of the vessel it is poured into, so the understanding (they assure us) imparts its own form, that of universality, to the thing perceived by it. The reader may here be left to judge whether this explanation is or is not subjectivist, or whether it deserves to be called a philosophical theory at all. It gives us no final sanction of truth whatever. It leaves us with no answer to the universal scepticism of Hume or to the undisguised subjectivism of those who trace all knowledge to the human subject alone. In short, it is either false, if it is taken in a subjectivist sense, or it is no philosophy if taken otherwise; for in this case it leaves the whole mystery unexplained—whereas the philosopher had undertaken to give us the ultimate reason which furnished a reason for all other things and had its own reason evident to all men in itself.

Perhaps it is to the theory here touched on that many later and more openly subjectivist systems owe their origin. However that be, the enemy has certainly come in like a flood in the last hundred years. His methods of attack are many, but in general he has turned his back on sensism. He recognizes the existence of *a priori* knowledge. Given the sensations, he says, there is something in the nature of the soul by which we know the existence of bodies having those sensible qualities. There is an energy within us which compels us to assert this; but by what right we do so, or whether there is truly such a universe as we assert, we cannot know. Or perhaps we maintain that we do know, but only relatively: we know as others do. It is not true knowledge; it is only that we declare it to be knowledge, but can never know that there is anything external to us corresponding with that assertion. Or, worse still, there is no absolute truth. We produce the universe from ourselves as a spider does its web, and thus surround ourselves perforce with a profound and hopeless illusion. For it practically comes to that. A soul that can produce its own ideas, that can take its mere sensations and by its own magical properties convert them into something wholly different and call the result Knowledge, must be said to produce the universe. But if it be maintained that a limited, particular, real subject can 'produce' something unlimited and universal and ideal,

what has been explained? Nothing: *obscurum per obscurius*, and therefore nothing. Either the soul must use something of itself to effect this singular production, or it must receive it from without. But by the very terms of this theory the cognition is not something of the soul, but is produced by it. The problem is therefore still unsolved.

Such a system, once formulated, was obviously at once in an unstable position, and began to move of its own accord. At first things in themselves were merely held to be unknowable by us. But the drift soon passed beyond that, and it was laid down that nothing, not even God, can subsist at all save from the human subject. The next steps were into more than one variety of pantheism. But, one and all, these systems of thought are unphilosophical, because they do not rest on a self-evident basis, but on an insoluble puzzle which really denies the validity of all knowledge. The very suicide of philosophy this, as well as the murder of much besides!

It was, in fact, inevitable that such systems, so ably argued, so loudly proclaimed, should influence the world very widely. Cardinal Newman, even in his early days, was already raising a warning cry against what he termed liberalism in religion, and it is patent how the same evil has done infinite mischief since then, profoundly affecting the multitude, but also beating against the adamantine barriers of Catholic theology and working its way in at unguarded points to confuse the faith of certain souls. Modernism was, of course, the offspring of subjectivism. It made an unhallowed union of Catholic thought and eternal and necessary doubt. It scarcely was a system, but in all its vagaries there was one constant mark. Truth, it said, was not set before the mind from without, but welled up like a spring within the subject, so that our own feelings were the final criterion of certainty. That certainty was but phenomenal or relative. Truth could not be really known, but it was wise to act as if we knew it. We were to distinguish 'truth in itself,' which was quite beyond our ken, from 'truth as seen by us,' which for the world's purposes was just as good as truth. Meanwhile, all the fair organization of Catholic dogma seemed to be left standing and flourishing undiminished, like a great fruit tree that has not yet fallen but has its roots secretly hacked through. Nothing, in short, can illustrate more clearly than Modernism how precisely contrary Christianity

is to any system which makes Knowledge come from feeling and the mind and nowhere else.

But what about the war? Can any practical connexion between it and false philosophy be solidly established? Certainly it cannot be demonstrated. When we pass from speculation to the living, bustling, jostling world we find countless forces so tangled and matted together that scientific proof of such a connexion need not be looked for. All the influences, indeed, of all the past go to form in their varying degrees each human character and event. It is only the quack who boldly refers the special features of an age to one cause. But, granted all this, it still remains exceedingly probable that there is the closest possible relation of effect and cause between the excesses of modern statecraft and the more hidden excesses of current philosophical theory.

Of the public evils of our time the worship of the State seems to stand first. That includes a disparagement of the moral law, which is not held binding when it comes counter to State-interests. The abuse of power for advancement of trade with an eye to commercial world-supremacy is no longer screened by fair-sounding words, but shamelessly and nakedly put forward as a justifiable aim. That is, on the whole, a new thing. Men loved wealth and power long ago; but now this covetousness is hallowed by a boldly enunciated theory. Is there no main root to be found from which such a portent grows? It cannot be merely man's inherited self-love. That belongs to all the ages; but in days when men recognized that the moral law was not just a pretty sentiment, but was in itself valid and inherently sovereign, efforts were at any rate made that public policy should keep up an appearance of seeking justice and of subordinating the interests of the State to the care of the human person for whom the State existed. The result was a mixture of the noble and the base. Faults there were in plenty, but faults, such as those of Christians, are against their principles, and commonly restrained by their principles from going to all lengths. So, too, in commercial and domestic life the sound moral theory at least maintained a standard of right and went to form a powerful public opinion, and thus acted as a permanent drag when man's evil instincts broke loose. But it is not so now. The radical assumptions which underlie the action of the multitude have changed vitally; and we find instead the

doctrine of the unchecked freedom of the State to do any wrong that it chooses for the sake of furthering its own ends of power or dominion. The supreme moral imperative appealing to each one's mind and will has been more than ignored; it has been denounced like an antiquated treaty that has outlived its use. Can there be any doubt about the source of the evil?

In different ages the one constant factor is man's own nature; we must therefore seek some variable element lately introduced. Not heresy in general. Heresies there have always been, but the older ones were in the main sound on the subjectivist question. Not the mere cooling of Christian fervour; not perplexities in the face of rival religious schemes. Mere indifference will indeed give birth to infinite slackness, but its influence is negative. It makes old foundations less secure, but another cause must be sought for the laying of new ones. Again, not the convenient name of Machiavelli, which has been used to cut too many Gordian knots and has solved none. His was doubtless an age and land in which theory was vigorously at work against all moral certainty; and the driving force of that was not just in any man, but in that Renaissance theorizing which was then so grave a danger to Italian thought. Doubtless Machiavelli crystallized it conveniently, and bad rulers of a later age were quite content to adopt his conclusions. Doubtless, his maxims insinuated themselves among the interwoven threads of political motives thenceforward. But it is absurd to trace all Machiavellianism to Machiavelli. If Frederick II of Prussia was his disciple he was also much besides. For Frederick was in the very mid-flood of that philosophical school which was drifting easily along from the starting-point of Locke by way of Berkeley and Hume to its natural end in subjectivism. This is not mere conjecture. Frederick was saturated with the French ideas of his time; and it was certainly the same theories which led to State-omnipotence of one pattern in Prussia and of quite another in Jacobinical France. But as yet the fluid opinions of licentious political thinkers were only beginning to harden into theory.

With us, however, the theory is in possession definitely formulated, and not by any means in one country only—one more reason for deprecating that crude account of the present war as between 'democracy' and 'autocracy.' The blight of all this false theory is traceable in so-called

'free' countries as well as in those which have a strong hereditary ruler; and the cause of our present calamities is not that the seat of sovereignty has been fixed in this or that estate of the realm, but lies in the doctrine of the absolute State unfettered by the moral law and free to extend its power to whatever lengths and by whatever means. All this rests immediately on the theory of the mere relativity of moral obligation. The fundamental ideas, it maintains—those of truth and justice first of all—do not come to us with sovereign voice from without, but are the product of our own minds and therefore have no intrinsic validity. It may be wise to treat them as if they were binding, but they are not so; and the unavoidable consequence follows. Freedom from the moral law is proclaimed to all the winds, and men hasten to take advantage of the proclamation. In short, when a theory is of universal application, when it has been framed by men of great intellectual power and adapted to practice by political leaders, when, moreover, it is one which chimes only too perfectly with all the baser desires of mankind, then if the natural results are found to follow we need not scruple to refer them mainly to this one cause. Private life has been infected by it and has produced the superman. A corrupt science of economy has applied it on the vastest scale to commerce, and corrupt politics have made an idol of the State, with the tearing up of scraps of paper and all the foul deeds of lawless war which are the fit climax to such a beginning. The evil extends far beyond the intentions of those who so unsettled the groundwork of certainty; it has weakened the sense of justice in whole peoples, and has imperilled civilization itself.

Much of this has been said many times already; but when we come to seek the true remedy it is only too evident that this wound has not been probed to the depths. To a Catholic, however, with the splendid expanse of the Church's Tradition behind him, it should be no hard matter. Nor should it be hard to anyone who, without prepossessions, will begin by observing the activities of the mind as they are. A child for the first time perceives something intellectually; his mother's face, for instance. Two things have happened here. He has felt through his senses, that is, his permanent bodily feeling has been modified. He has also made an intellectual act of affirmation. The matter of that affirmation is the feeling, and

comes wholly from the senses; but he has now added to it something quite different. He has affirmed its existence. The idea of existence in general was therefore already before him, so that as soon as the senses gave him material he could predicate existence of it. This idea was neither drawn from the bodily feeling nor found in the sentient subject. If it were, certainty would be impossible. And if we say that the idea is produced by the mind, we simply throw the difficulty one step further back, because what we want to know is where the mind got it from. The word 'produced' so evidently leaves the whole problem unsolved. The mind only produces as a chemist produces a compound of two elements. He produces water from two gases, but he must have those gases supplied him from without. And by no less necessity, the first idea also must come to the mind from without. That is, it is not subjective.

The nature of the idea can be well seen by comparing it with feeling. On one side we have the material for thought in the whole sphere of sensations, a whole made up of countless single feelings, each of them brief, local, changeful, real, finite. Then, on the other side, there is the formal element of thought which distinguishes knowing from feeling. The first idea, which is the root or ground of all the other ideas (for in all these we not only feel something by the senses, exterior or interior, but also say within ourselves that the thing *is* so), this first idea stands before the mind in the magnificent dignity of its unique qualities, for it is eternal, infinite, changeless, ubiquitous—not as God is, but as ideas are. Certainly, then, it is not the product of the finite human mind. For how can the finite give birth to the infinite? Or how can contradictories be true at once?

Truth, then, *is*. It is set before the mind as the mind's object, and just by that ideal presence there the mind is a mind and is capable of knowing. If we grasp this thought rightly we see that the primary idea, in which all special ideas are implicitly enclosed, is its own evidence. It is pure light, the light in which we see all things. By it certainty is indeed certainty, and the authority of the moral law is not relative, but absolute. Once admit the subjectivist or quasi-subjectivist account, and you involve all things in perpetual darkness and hopeless conjecture; but meet it with a clear recognition of the objectivity of truth, and you straightway have the dawn. Outlines of facts grow clearer on every side of you as the day brightens.

It is surely worth while to recall attention to all this during war time, and to point to the Church herself as the protagonist against crafty forms of error which have proved so fatal. For there has certainly been a Tradition throughout the Church's course that truth is not our creature, but our master; that it is not an inexplicable secretion of the mind, but exists and has existed from eternity unchanged outside us—that is, in the mind of God, the one Being who is *per se* intelligible, and in whom real and ideal being are identified; and lastly, that the human mind's first act is to see this simple idea shining upon it, and that this is its first step towards all the philosophies and sciences. These truths St. Augustine used to proclaim amidst the downfall of empires. They are scattered everywhere in his works; that the mind is a 'partaker of immutable truth'; that 'the light of the mind is above the mind and excels every mind'; or again, that 'the light of truth and justice is everywhere present to every thinking subject.' The thinker may change, he adds; may become untruthful, unjust, but this light still abides, *ubique præsto est*. Can words lay more clearly the foundation of the objectivity of the truth? St. Thomas, the gatherer-up of all Christian Tradition, sometimes speaks indeed of the mind as drawing all from the senses, meaning that it draws the matter of its thoughts from them, but he is as certain as his master, St. Augustine, that the active energy of the mind 'partakes in a certain way of intellectual light coming from substances outside the mind.' Here we have the crucial point which the unsatisfactory theories now so prevalent have never grasped. They cannot, however, alter the Church's Tradition, though they may ruin human societies.

It is, indeed, wonderful how many, in these days, are eager to contribute their stone to the laying of foundations for the commonweal of the future, and what discordant counsels there are about the method to be chosen. One plan has certainly been tried and found wanting. Its rival system, the rock itself, the very truth of truth, is still waiting, that we may build upon it the new city sound and strong, compact together. We are asked to-day, in a word, whether truth is subjective or objective, and perhaps the very worst plan of all is to put off answering.

W. H. POLLARD.

ALLEGED SOURCES OF GENESIS I-III

BY REV. C. LATTEY, S.J.

IN the present article some criticisms will be offered upon the division of these three chapters into two supposed sources, as the first example, and an important one, of the working of the 'Documentary Hypothesis.' Some account of this latter was given by Father Manning, S.J., in the *I. E. RECORD*, for August, 1916,¹ when writing of 'Wellhausen and the Levitical Priesthood.' What should especially be noticed, what gives to the Documentary Hypothesis its peculiar character, is that the main sources which are proposed for the Pentateuch are also said to mark stages in the historical development of the Jews. The Jahvistic (Yahwistic) and Elohist sources, known as J and E, are said to date from the eighth or ninth century, and these, speaking quite broadly, are taken to represent the trustworthy narratives of primitive fact. The Book of Deuteronomy, which we may take as roughly equivalent to the source D, is admitted by all students alike to have been found by the priest Helcias in the Temple in 621 B.C. (4 Kings xxii. 8). The critics, however, would further maintain that the book had been written but a little time before, and many of them, indeed, would regard the whole proceeding as fraudulent, and the finding as an elaborate fiction. In any case, they would say that D put into Moses' mouth regulations which were found desirable at the latter date. But in the case of the Priestly Code, P, comprising all Leviticus, and also fragments, large and small, of Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and Josue, not merely was this done, but a history of the Mosaic period was concocted in accordance with the later laws, as though they had been substantially in force from the beginning. This last source would date from the Babylonian exile, in the sixth century.

¹ See *I. E. RECORD*, Fifth Series, vol. viii. pp. 89 et seq.

One only has to realize the general character of what is assigned to the Priestly Code to see that this Documentary Hypothesis, if accepted, must profoundly affect our interpretation of the whole of the Old Testament. If the Priestly Code was of obligation, it must have deeply coloured the life and customs both of nation and individual from the very beginning; if it did not exist, the exile brought about a transformation almost rivalling that needed on the rationalistic hypothesis to develop Christianity from the work of Christ. For to the Priestly Code is relegated, not merely what belongs to systematic chronology, but what belongs to systematic religion. 'In P's picture of the Mosaic age,' says Dr. Driver,¹ 'the minute description of the tabernacle, sacrifices, and other ceremonial institutions, the systematic marshalling of the nation by tribes and families, and the unity of purpose and action which in consequence regulates its movements (Numbers i-iv. x. 11-28, etc.), are the most conspicuous features.' And hence we may say that the Documentary Hypothesis, such as we know it in its main essentials to-day, sprang into being, not when Astruc, in the eighteenth century, first essayed to use the divine names as a basis for the partition of a Pentateuch still acknowledged Mosaic, but when Reuss, in the nineteenth, stated the view that the Priestly Code was not, as supposed till then, the most ancient, but the latest of the component documents. His theory was popularized by Graf and Wellhausen, and outside the Church it holds the field to-day. It marked the final passage into evolutionary rationalism; for the Priestly Code is no longer a historical document at all, but an audacious attempt—to say no more—to read back the institutions of a later time into primitive history.

It is not any mere question of sources as such, then, that makes the Documentary Hypothesis impossible to accept, but the historical conclusions involved in the hypothesis, such as it is actually propounded. It may be admitted without difficulty that a Biblical work may draw upon sources themselves either Biblical or non-Biblical. The author of the second book of Machabees, for example, tells us that he is summarizing a work in five books, by Jason of Cyrene (2 Mach. ii. 24); and the regular appeal by the writer of the third and fourth books of Kings to the royal chronicles of Israel or Judah make it inevitable to

¹ *The Book of Genesis*, ed. 9, p. 23.

suppose that he had these before him and drew upon them. Indeed, in the very case of the Pentateuch, the Biblical Commission, in its decree of June 27, 1906, expressly declares that Moses may have had recourse to sources, either written or oral. But the Documentary Hypothesis involves the denial of the historical character of at least a large part of the Pentateuch, and excludes Moses from any share, or any but the smallest share, in its authorship.

At the outset it is well to distinguish the literary and the historical aspect of the discussion. From the literary point of view we may notice as significant that, on the general question of the language of P, Driver is rather on the defensive than inclined to use it as an argument for himself,¹ and under present limitations of space we must be content to leave it at that.

The use of the divine names, too, is not made so much of nowadays, indeed the 'critics' are at some pains to show that they rely less on this argument than is often supposed. Still, it remains a very prominent feature in their system, especially in regard of the chapters before us, so that it appears to be worth while to deal with it at some length, and more systematically than Catholic writers are wont to do. None the less, it may be premised that in any case it would not by itself prove the separate existence of P, since in J and E we should have sources capable of appropriating either divine name as it came.

The strongest argument for P as a separate source, based, that is, on the divine names, comes from Exodus vi. 3. God declares that He appeared unto Abraham and Isaac and Jacob as El Shaddai (translated rather dubiously as 'God Almighty'), 'but by my name Yahweh I was not known to them.' This, then, is regarded as a proof 'that Genesis xv. 7, xxviii. 13, as also the numerous passages in Genesis in which the patriarchs make use of this name, cannot have been written by the same author.'² This is certainly a formidable argument; yet, is it sufficient of itself to settle the whole question? It is only a consideration of the evidence as a whole—and that, indeed, more detailed than we can attempt here—that can embolden us to answer in the negative; but even so, if the question is to be kept open at all, an alternative interpretation of the verse must be set forth at once. May we not say, then,

¹ *Lit. O.T.*, pp. 155-7.

² Driver, *The Book of Genesis*, p. 8.

that the name Yahweh now acquired a significance which it had not hitherto possessed? 'Henceforth,' says the French Crampon Bible, *ad loc.*, 'the name Yahweh will be the proper name, the official title of the God of Israel, and this new relation will inaugurate a new phase in the history of human salvation.' How many Fathers and medieval writers have used eloquent and devout words in reference to Our Lord's Heart, and how dear to many was the devotion to the Five Wounds; and yet might we not say that the Sacred Heart was not revealed to anyone before Blessed Margaret Mary? And this sense seems to be indicated by Holy Writ itself, in the passage under consideration, for, in Exodus vi. 7, it is written, 'ye shall know that I am Yahweh your God,' that is, they shall understand the full significance of the name; up to that time they will not have 'known' it any better than Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob 'knew' it.

Curiously enough, as Wiener has pointed out,¹ this argument for the building up of P can be used for the demolition of J. According to Genesis iv. 26, it was after the birth of Enosh that 'men began to call upon the name of Yahweh,' literally, as Driver rightly explains, 'to call *with*, i.e., to use the name in invocations, in the manner of ancient cults, especially at times of sacrifice.'

Yet [to return to Wiener] not only does the Tetragrammaton occur very freely in the narrative of the preceding chapters, but it is actually put into the mouth of Eve, the grandmother of Enosh, long before Seth, his father, had been born. She is made to say, 'I have gotten a man with *the Lord*' (Genesis iv. 1). How is it possible, on the critical theory? Why is it conceivable that the author of J could do that which, *ex hypothesi*, the author of the Pentateuch could not?²

How, indeed, can it be supposed that Eve, who avows in a so-called J section, that it is 'with Jahweh's³ help' that she has borne a son, had never invoked Almighty God as Yahweh? As a matter of fact, on page 17, Wiener—inadvertently, one would think—gives away his own argument by changing the divine name in Genesis iv. 1, from 'Yahweh' (i.e. Lord) to 'God.' But the 'critics' appear to be right in charging him with setting too high

¹ *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, p. 8.

² Genesis iv. 1.

³ The Jews avoided the use of the divine name 'Yahweh,' (or 'Jehovah,' as it has come through a misunderstanding to be presented in English), and usually read the word for 'Lord' in place of it. Hence it appears as 'Lord' in the Septuagint, Vulgate, and most later versions.

a value upon the Greek Septuagint, important as that version is, and this emendation seems to be due to this exaggerated predilection. If, then, as Driver would have it, we must explain Genesis iv. 26 of a more formal recognition of the name, why not suppose that Exodus vi. 3 represents yet another stage in the same direction? It may be noted in passing, though the issue involved cannot possibly be discussed here, that the data 'seem sufficient to show that there was a West-Semitic deity, Ya-u, known as early as c. 2100 B.C.'¹ This name may be identical with Yahweh, of which the etymology, or rather explanation, may be merely popular, like the explanation of Babel (Babylon) from the verb *balal*.

To pass now from Exodus vi. 3 to the consideration of the divine names in general. Not infrequently their distribution is inconsistent with the division into sources as expounded by the critics. In the case of the Book of Genesis, Wiener² finds 'Yahweh' is out of place in two passages of P (Genesis xvii. 1, xxi. 1b: 'in both cases a redactor or copyist has to be invoked to get rid of it'), and in four passages of E (Genesis xv. 1-2, xxii. 11, xxvii. 7b: 'in all cases recourse is had as usual to a redactor'); but the fourth passage seems to be more generally assigned to J, while he counts *Elohim* ('God') in J as often as nineteen times (but it seems safer to reduce the number to fifteen). However, as Wiener truly says, 'an even more serious objection is to be found in the divisions which the critics are compelled to effect in order to carry through their theory.' These, it must be remembered, are only the misfits that obstinately remain, after every artifice has been exhausted to make the names suit the sections, and the sections the names. Perhaps we cannot do better than to quote the rest of the same rather breezy paragraph from Wiener, only explaining that the particular work he has in view throughout is *The Hexateuch according to the Revised Version, arranged in its constituent documents by members of the Society of Historical Theology, Oxford*, edited by J. Estlin Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby:—

It is one thing to suggest that a continuous passage like Genesis i. 1-ii. 3, or xi. 1-9, or xiv. may be ultimately derived from a separate source; it is quite another to postulate such proceedings as are attributed to the redactors of the critical case. The following instances are limited to

¹ Driver, *Genesis*, Addenda ii, p. 47.

² *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, pp. 7, 8.

those in which the appellations of the Deity are the sole or determining criterion; in xvi. the use of the Tetragrammaton in verse 2 compels Mr. Carpenter to wrench 1b and 2 from a P context and assign them to J; in xix. verse 29 is torn from a J chapter, in which it fits perfectly, to be given to P; in xx. the last verse is assigned to a redactor, though all the rest of the chapter goes to E, and the verse is required for the explanation of 17; in xxii. verses 14-18 go to redactors because the story is assigned to E (a redactor being responsible for the Tetragrammaton in 11). An even more flagrant instance occurs in xxviii. 21, where Mr. Carpenter is compelled to scoop out the words 'and the Lord will be my God' and assign them to J, the beginning and end of the verse going to E. What manner of man was this redactor who constructed a narrative on these strange principles? In xxxi. verse 3 has to go to a redactor, because the preceding and subsequent verses belong to E, yet that gentleman actually postulates the redactor's work by referring to the statement of 3 in verse 5. However, he receives compensation in xxii., where verse 30 is wrenched from a J context for his enrichment, though verse 31 (J) cannot be understood without it.

This, then, may suffice as a comment on this vivisection in general; the case of Genesis i.-iii. will be examined by itself shortly. Wiener then goes on to treat at length of the distribution of the divine names from the standpoint of textual criticism, and therein it seems to us that, as Plato hath it, there is something in what he says, yet not so much as he thinks. In any case this issue can scarcely be dealt with unless it be at great length; and it may therefore, be wiser to pass at once on to more certain ground, the substitution of *Elohim* (God) for *Yahweh*, that is admitted to have occurred in certain Old Testament documents, and which may, therefore, be the reason why the divine names are occasionally mingled in the Pentateuch in a way that cannot be accounted for by connotation or context. Driver, for example, in his *Genesis*,¹ expressly says that the Chronicler 'is apt to shew a preference for *Elohim* (though he also uses *Yahweh*), and sometimes changes *Yahweh* of his source into *Elohim*; and the exceptional preponderance of *Elohim* over *Yahweh* in Book II of the Psalms, and in Psalms 73-83, as compared with the rest of the Psalter, shews that here the editor, or collector, must have substituted it for an original *Yahweh*.' We omit his references, but the reader may easily see what is meant by comparing Psalm 13 (14) with Psalm 52 (53), remembering that 'Lord' stands for *Yahweh*. If then, we ask, the Psalmist (in Psalm 13) and the Chronicler (i.e., in Chronicles, Paralipomenon) may fluctuate in their use of

¹ Excursus i, p 407.

the divine names, why not Moses? If 'Yahweh' may come to be changed elsewhere, why not in the Pentateuch? And if the name be so changed, it is unlikely, as Driver himself observes,¹ that there will be anything in the context to betray the fact.

There is also a curious example of this interchange of the divine names outside the Biblical record, which it would be a pity to omit. Schrader² points out that in two inscriptions of Sargon II of Assyria (722-705 B.C.) 'Jahubi'd' and 'Ilubi'd' stand for the same individual, a king, and that this is due to the interchange of 'Ilu' ('God' corresponding to 'Elohim,' or more strictly to the short form 'El') and 'Jahu' (or 'Yahu,' 'Yahweh'). As a parallel to this he recalls the change of Eliakim's name to Jehoiakim in 2 (4) Kings xxiii. 34.

And now let us come to the chapters more immediately under consideration. Much stress has, indeed, been laid on them by modern 'critics,' because nowhere else, perhaps, does the hypothesis of a duplicate narrative, borne out by a divergent use of the divine names, appear at first sight so convincing. And yet a careful analysis of the facts is far from bearing out such an impression, and it will more than repay us to have sifted thoroughly at least one such concrete example. From the beginning of Genesis to the middle of Genesis ii. 4 is assigned to P, but the second part of that verse ('in the day . . .') had to wait some centuries for its subject and verb, for from here to the end of the fourth chapter is apportioned to J.

We begin, then, by remarking that it is not right to speak of the first two chapters as duplicate narratives, for there is a different purpose running through each of them. To put it broadly, we may say that in the first chapter the account of creation is given for its own sake, while in the second we merely have the setting for the story of the Fall, starting, not from a general creation, but from the making of man and the garden. Nor can it be said that there is any discrepancy between the two accounts, provided the general character of the first chapter be recognized, as it has been set forth, for example, by Father O'Hea, S.J., in the I. E. RECORD, for March, 1917.³

Again, the so-called 'second creation' does not really fit in with J, any more than the 'first creation' fits in

¹ *Genesis*, Addenda ii. pp. 45, 46.

² *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, vol. i. pp. 23, 24.

³ See I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, vol. ix. pp. 196 et seq.

with P. Whoever has carefully perused the article just mentioned will easily understand that there is nothing really like the first chapter of Genesis in the whole of the Pentateuch. It is a unique opening to a unique book. The rhythmical and symmetrical character peculiar to it does not recur in P, but renders the chapter much more different from the rest of P than the rest of P is from J. To speak of the rest of P as 'homogeneous in style and character with Genesis i. 1-ii. 4a'¹ is to betray astounding literary obtuseness.

As regards the 'second creation,' we have already remarked how awkwardly, on the critics' hypothesis, it is joined to the first. The use of 'Lord God' compels them to assign the second part of Genesis ii. 4 to J, which follows on, but the word 'generations,' which precede, is considered a characteristic P word, and therefore must refer to what precedes. This it may well do in any case; but because the formula, 'These are the generations,' usually precedes the account to which it belongs, Driver (*ad loc.*) notices favourably the desire of many critics to prefix Genesis ii. 4 (first half) to the whole book, and to assign its removal to the compiler—a glaring example of the lack of literary discernment so often displayed by the 'higher critics,' implying as it does an entire want of appreciation of the present magnificent opening. St. John the Evangelist had better felt its force: 'In the beginning created God . . .'; nay, 'In the beginning was the Word'!

But, in the 'second creation,' as a whole, it is the divine names that are especially at fault. Yahweh does not appear alone, even once, in the second or third chapter, but it is always either 'Yahweh Elohim' or 'Elohim,' the latter in Genesis iii. 1, 3, 5, contrary to the whole modern scheme. Further, 'Yahweh Elohim' simply, the latter without a pronominal suffix, is very generally considered an anomaly; the two names occur together twenty times up to the end of Genesis iii. but only very rarely elsewhere, and many scholars (e.g., Kittel in his Hebrew Bible, in the *apparatus* to Genesis ii. 4, and the Oxford Hebrew Dictionary, page 219) think, rightly enough, that one of the names should go. Only, according to the textual evidence, as Kittel makes clear, and as Wiener forcibly shows,² the latter, unfortunately, without any reference to the Old Latin, it is unquestionably 'Yahweh' that should be

¹ Driver, *Genesis*, p. 4.

² *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, p. 29.

regarded as an interpolation, not merely because it is not found in Genesis iii. 1, 3, 5, but because in some other verses (Genesis ii. 9, 21), the Septuagint and Old Latin agree in ousting it, and there is other evidence tending in the same direction, but none, I think, in favour of keeping 'Yahweh' alone. The Old Latin may be seen in Dom Sabatier's great volumes (*Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae*, 1751), or in *Augustine's Versions of Genesis*, by John S. M'Intosh (Chicago, 1912). Thus the use of the divine names in reality furnishes a damaging argument against the 'critical' treatment of the first three chapters.

Passing from the use of the divine names to the use of 'characteristic words' in general, we may still use these chapters to show the weakness of the 'critical' contention, so far as it regards P. But first some remarks of a more general kind. No doubt a list of words truly characteristic of P can be compiled; but this was bound to be the case, given the peculiar nature of the passages assigned to P. As Wiener puts it,¹ 'the argument amounts to saying that in a technical passage technical terms are used.' If all that belongs to systematic chronology, liturgy, and the rest be relegated to P, it follows that terms which are chronological, liturgical, and so forth will abound there, and perhaps be found there only, and perhaps bring with them other less immediately technical terms. If the reader of a history of the present war were convinced that a special writer had been employed to describe the war by sea, he could easily prove it (if proof it were) by a list of words including such terms as 'submarine,' 'torpedo,' 'cruiser'; and on the same principles he might discover a separate source for the parts concerned with the war in the air, the war in Mesopotamia, and various other departments or aspects of the struggle. Such an argument from language, taken simply on its own merits, would be worthless. On the other hand, supposing that in the narration of *precisely similar* events there were paragraphs in which 'soldiers,' 'guns,' 'advanced,' and several other words were consistently used, and others in which 'Tommies,' 'cannon,' 'went forward,' and other alternative synonyms were employed with equal constancy—then we should be justified in at least suspecting that a compiler had made up his narrative from different sources.

Now, the words which Driver² gives as characteristic

¹ *Pentateuchal Studies*, p. 206.

² *Genesis*, pp. 8, 9.

of P are evidently, in the main, words that belong to it in the very nature of the case, words consequently that are no criterion of origin. The first eight belong to the first chapter. To discuss these thoroughly would require much space, and would be a great weariness to the reader. Perhaps the general drift of the rebutting argument will be sufficiently perceived when it is pointed out that (1) the word 'kind' (i.e., species, etc.) is used ten times in Genesis i., seven times in the Flood narrative, and nine times in the enumeration of Leviticus xi.; otherwise in the Old Testament only in Deuteronomy xiv. 13-18; Ezekiel xlvi. 10, neither of which passages, of course, belongs to P; (2) 'creep' and 'creeping things' are used seven times here, thirteen times in the Flood, and twice in Leviticus xi.; otherwise, in the Pentateuch, only in Leviticus xx. 25, Deuteronomy iv. 18, the latter once more not in P. Evidently we have here words needed only in a peculiar context, and, given the nature of the passages assigned to P, that context can hardly fail to be a P context. As we have said, to show the full force of this criticism of the 'characteristic words' of P would be intricate and tedious.

But it may be urged, these literary arguments about sources are only one side of the 'critical' case; there are duplicate narratives or precepts which differ, not merely in style, but also in content, so that they are in reality inconsistent. Well, as a matter of fact, we have already had occasion in this article to offer some criticism of the contention that Genesis opens with two inconsistent narratives of creation; and in the I. E. RECORD, for March, 1916,¹ Father Baillon, S.J., writing of the Flood, incidentally demolished the attempt to distinguish two inconsistent accounts of that episode. As regards the supposed stages of liturgical and sacerdotal development, culminating in P, which is supposed to read back into the age of Moses regulations which only came into force after the exile, Father Manning, S.J., in the I. E. RECORD, for August, 1916,² in his article, 'Wellhausen and the Levitical Priesthood,' to which we referred at the outset, has shown that even where Wellhausen appears most specious, the traditional view has nothing to fear from a sound and sane exegesis. To place P so late in the history only produces a fresh crop of difficulties. Thus enough has already been

¹ See I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, vol. vii. pp. 209 et seq.

² Ibid. vol. viii. pp. 89 et seq.

done to make it clear that the rationalist position—for such in truth it is—lies no less open to attack on its historical than on its literary side. And yet, surely, the *onus probandi*, the duty of justifying their attitude, lies in reality, not with us, but rather with those who depart from an age-long tradition, in denying unity and truth to a work that obviously claims it.

Indeed, as regards the truth of the matter, it appears safe to say that recent discoveries, such as those of Hammurabi's code, of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, and of the Elephantine papyri, have in various ways strengthened the argument for the historical character of the Priestly Code. The rationalist position finds its *raison d'être*, not in historical evidence, but in an *a priori* evolutionary philosophy. However, it has been the object of this essay to examine, not into the trustworthiness of P, taken on its own merits, but into the need of separating it and constituting it an independent source, and that, again, in such a way as to discuss in detail only one particular instance or proof, though perhaps the most important.

CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J.

THE JOURNALS OF THE IRISH PARLIAMENT

BY MICHAEL MACDONAGH

WERE it not for the happy decision of the Lords and Commons of Ireland to print their Journals, which in the case of the Commons was come to not only tardily but perilously near to the end of their existence, an intimate appreciation of the life and character of the old Irish Parliament would, it is not too much to say, have been impossible in the twentieth century. The Lords Journals are in eight thick folio volumes, exhaustively indexed. The Commons Journals are in nineteen volumes of the same size and bulk. Each volume of the Commons Journals has two parts. The first part is the record of the proceedings; and the second contains the financial returns, and other official papers, laid before the House, with a fine index of the entire volume. Accordingly, the Commons Journals really run to thirty-eight volumes. Of all the material things of the Irish Parliament which have survived, the most valuable and precious—in the judgment of the historical writer, at least—are these forty-six printed volumes of the Journals of both Houses in which are set out the Acts passed and the resolutions come to by the Lords and Commons of Ireland.

The Journals of the House of Commons begin on May 18, 1613, when the first Irish Parliament of James the First assembled in Dublin. The papers of the earlier Parliaments appear to have been destroyed or lost in the changes and commotions attending the Reformation, or, rather, the vain attempt to make Ireland Protestant. But in the year 1613 Elizabeth's work of political and social conquest was supposed to be completed. The native Irish were subdued. Their chiefs of the north, Tyrone and Tyrconnell, were driven into exile. The Plantation of Ulster with settlers from England and Scotland was being carried out. No more trouble was apprehended in Ireland. It was at this time, also, that Dublin became the permanent home of

the Parliament. Hitherto the Parliament had a perambulatory existence in the provinces, meeting in such towns as Kilkenny, Drogheda, and Trim, which had an abbey or monastery with a great hall or refectory, capable of accommodating the two Houses. The fixing of Dublin as the Parliament's place of meeting tended to the preservation of the records. As regards the Lords, the printed series of their Journals are of a later date still than those of the Commons. They do not begin until 1634, and start with the first Irish Parliament of Charles the First, when Lord Wentworth, better known as Strafford, was Lord Lieutenant. The Journals of both Houses continue till the Union in 1800.

The Lords were the first to decide to print their Journals. That was in 1779. It was not until 1795 that the Commons—five years only before their extinction—came to the same resolution. Fortunately, however, the work was well advanced at the time of the Union. One of the last things done by the Commons was to vote £1,525 for the printing of the concluding volume—the eighth—of the Lord's Journals. At the same time the Commons appointed a Committee to arrange for the completion of the printing of their own records. The Committee reported to the House that £39,661 14s. had already been spent on the printing and binding of their Journals and the payment of gratuities to the compilers; and that a further sum of £15,201 11s. 11d. was required to finish the work. The money was voted. Sets of 610 copies of each volume of both Journals were printed, 300 for the Lords and 310 for the Commons. Twelve additional sets were 'printed on superfine paper and bound in the most complete and perfect manner,' for presentation, among others, to the King, the Speaker of the House of Commons, at Westminster, for his private library, and the Universities of Dublin, Oxford, and Cambridge. The sets of the Journals which I have had the pleasure of reading are those in the library of George the Third, which was presented to the British Museum in 1823 by George the Fourth. The covers are in red leather, with a gold border. At each of the four corners there is an additional decoration, also in gold, of crossed maces surmounted by a crown.

There are some interruptions in the continuous run of the Irish Journals, as in the English Journals. These blanks are due, in each case, to parts of the manuscript

documents having been lost, mislaid, or misappropriated. In the case of the English Parliament, Cardinal Wolsey tore out several leaves of the manuscript Journals of the House of Lords, which contained entries that were disagreeable to him; and Charles the First, in a similarly high-handed way, destroyed the official account of his unconstitutional visit to the House of Commons to arrest the five members. No such sensational episodes are associated with the history of the earlier Irish Journals. Where the loss of the missing parts is not accounted for by religious and civil commotions, or by the long periods of time that separated the Parliaments, it can be traced to the rather common practice of statesmen in those days to seize and retain for their own use and security papers rightly belonging to the State. As we shall see later, statesmen were also not above tampering with the records with a view to their future personal advantage.

Some of the records thus appropriated have been discovered in private collections of papers since the printing of the Journals. Among them is the earliest fragment of the original official Journals now extant—the Journal of the House of Lords in what is known as ‘Perrott’s Parliament.’ This Parliament was the third and last Irish Parliament of Queen Elizabeth. It assembled in Dublin on the summons of Sir John Perrot, the Lord Deputy, and lasted from April 26, 1585, to May 13, 1586. The Journal was found among the Carte manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. These are the immense mass of documents, running to 109 volumes, which were collected by Thomas Carte, the historian—who lived in the first half of the eighteenth century—for his *Life of James Duke of Ormond*, and other works relating to Ireland in the reign of Charles the First. The Journal forms the first nine of the 529 leaves in the sixty-first volume of the collection. It is written in the ordinary Elizabethan court hand, on paper older and quite distinct from the rest of the volume, which consists for the most part of the official papers of Sir Arthur Chichester, Lord Deputy, and Sir John Davies, Attorney-General, at the time of the first Irish Parliament of James the First in 1613, with which, as I have said, the printed Journals of the House of Commons begin. It is published in full, with notes by Mr. F. J. Routledge, in the *English Historical Review*, for January, 1914.

The opening leaf of the Journal is missing; and as the

first entry is dated May 3, 1585, there are, consequently, six days of the sittings of the House of Lords of which there is no record. The Bills passed were an Act of Attainder of James Eustace, Viscount Baltinglas, and his four brothers, all of whom had been prominent in the rising of the Earl of Desmond against Elizabeth, and an Act restoring to his rights of blood and lineage Lawrence Delahide, whose father had been attainted of high treason in 1536. The first entry in the Journal is as follows: 'Th' act for th' attayndor of James Eustace and others was ones red, which was the third reading thereof, and being put to voices it past as an acte with the consent of the whole house.' The ceremony of bringing the first session to an end is thus described:—

Tuysdate the XXVth of May, 1585. The right honorable Sir John Perrot, knight, lord deputie generall of Ireland and the rest of the lords spirituall and temporall, and the Comens assembled in the parliament house; and the said lord deputie gave the royall assent upon th' act of attayndor of James Eustace and others and upon th' acte for restoring Lawrence Delahide to his blod, and the same daye did adorne and prorogue the parliament to Thurisday the next following, being the XXVIIth of the saide monethe of May 1585 to be holden in the same place.

The last entry in the Journal deals with the meeting of the two Houses for the dissolution on May 14, 1586, at the end of the second session. The Lord Deputy gave the Royal Assent to the Acts passed, which included 'th' act against witchcraft and sorcery' and the 'acte against fording, etc., of evidences and writings, etc.' Then the final words: 'And the same daye his lordship did end and dissolve the Parliament.'

How did the Journal of 1585-6 come to be included in the official papers of Chichester and Davies? Davies was appointed Speaker in the Parliament of 1613, and it is probable that he borrowed this Journal of the last preceding Parliament that had been held in Ireland to consult it as an authority on forms and procedure, and neglected to return it afterwards to its official custodians. I find in the printed Commons Journals for May, 1764, an entry which describes a somewhat similar instance of the misappropriation of parliamentary records. One Michael Dugan sent a petition to the House stating that he was in possession of an old manuscript of the Journals of the House from November, 1641, to March 29, 1647, relating to the second Irish Parliament of Charles the First. He stated

that he bought it from Mrs. Mary Kelly, widow of William Kelly, who was Clerk to Sir Stephen Rice, Chief Baron of the Exchequer under King James the Second. A committee which was appointed to examine the manuscript found it to be authentic, and they recommended that Dugan should be compensated with a sum not exceeding £200.

This incident is of some historical importance also. The saying is attributed to Rice that he would 'drive a coach and six horses through the Act of Settlement,' which was passed in the reign of Charles the Second, legalizing the Cromwellian confiscation of most of the lands of the Catholic Irish and Anglo-Irish who took part in the Catholic Rebellion of 1642, or sided with Charles the First in the subsequent struggle with the English Parliament. One of the great purposes of the famous Catholic Parliament of 1689, opened in person by James the Second—after he was deposed by his English subjects and the Crown transferred to William, Prince of Orange—was the uprooting of this Settlement; and as Rice took a prominent part in the judicial part of the work, he may have borrowed, for his guidance, the official record of the second Irish Parliament of the First Charles, in which the national disturbance originated. Rice survived until 1715. His last public appearance continues the story of Irish wrong and oppression. He was selected by the leading Catholics who survived the Jacobite war to plead at the Bar of the House of Commons on February 22, 1703; and at the Bar of the House of Lords on February 28, against the Bill 'to prevent the further growth of Popery' (2 Anne, chap. 6), and to plead also for the carrying out of the treaty entered into at the capitulation of Limerick—the last place to hold out for the Stuart king—which was intended to secure to the Catholics religious toleration and security of property, under the new order of things. Rice pleaded in vain. The Treaty of Limerick was outrageously violated by the passing of the Penal Laws.

Volume VIII of the Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, published in 1913, contains an account of another remarkable discovery of the manuscript Journal of the House of Lords for part of the same period—1640–1641—in a collection of papers made in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by the first three Viscounts Molesworth, of the Irish peerage. This manuscript Journal contains a number of passages, amounting to more than

4,000 words in the aggregate, which are not to be found in the printed Journal, nor in the rough original notebook—made presumably by the Clerk of the Parliaments (Clerk of the House of Lords), and preserved in the Public Record Office of Ireland—from which the Journal as printed was copied. In a few cases, where the passage omitted was not of very great length, it was found in the Record Office notebook, but had been so carefully scored out as to be almost illegible. I have no doubt that the volume under notice was intended also to serve as a notebook, from which the Journals were afterwards to be copied in a fuller and permanent form, and proves, I think, that the practice which prevails to-day in both Houses of the Imperial Parliament, of keeping two minute books of the proceedings for the sake of greater accuracy, prevailed also in the Irish Parliament.

One very important discrepancy between this manuscript Journal and the printed Journal is pointed out by Mr. D. A. Chart, who made the report on the subject of the document to the Historical Manuscripts Commission. While the printed Journal makes no mention of any sitting of the House of Lords on March 5, 1641, the manuscript Journal records a rather stormy meeting on that day, the proceedings of which, 'owing,' says Mr. Chart, 'presumably, to the abstraction from the Irish Record Office copy of the leaf showing the change of date,' are confused in the printed Journal with the proceedings of the previous day. Mr. Chart makes the interesting comment on the omissions and suppressions that they were done by some one who took the Royalist view of the burning political questions of the time—the liberty of Parliament and the punishment of Strafford and his associates.

Thus [he says] when the judges are called in by the Lords to advise whether an Irish Parliament can continue to sit on the death of the Lord Deputy, pending the arrival of a new governor, the official copy is found to omit several of the bolder statements made on this subject, which the copy in these manuscripts gives in detail. Again, when the Lord Chancellor is accused of treason, the Record Office copy omits passages of great length and importance, which are here given in full.

Mr. Chart also suggests that

seeing that the suppressed passages nearly all contain matter either obnoxious to the Lord Chancellor (as in the case of the judge's opinions) or reflecting on his character (as in the accusation of treason), and that he probably had custody of, or access to, the official copies of the Journals,

it seems likely that the changes made in the official copy were due either to his action or to that of some fervent Restoration loyalist; and that the volume may possibly have come into the possession of the Molesworths by the marriage of Edward Bolton, probably a descendant of Sir Richard Bolton, the accused Lord Chancellor, with Lettice Molesworth about 1720.

The Journals of the English Parliament have been valuably supplemented by several private diaries kept by members at various periods for their own amusement or information, which, published long afterwards, supply incidents and speeches not to be found in the more formal official records. In the case of Ireland there is only one diary of the kind, and that happens to be the very earliest document now extant of the nature of a Journal of the Irish Parliament. It is the diary of the Elizabethan Parliament of 1568, kept by John Hooker, *alias* Vowell, the English antiquary. Hooker came to Ireland as solicitor to Sir Peter Carew, the soldier and adventurer, and particularly for the purpose of supporting his patron's claim that certain extensive estates in Munster and Leinster rightly belonged to one of his ancestors. He remained in Ireland, and was returned to Parliament, as a burgess of the borough of Athenry. For the guidance of the Irish House of Commons he drew up a report on the procedure at Westminster, which will be found in *The Ancient Parliaments of Ireland*, a work by Lord Mountmorres, published in 1792. Of greater historical interest still is Hooker's diary of the daily proceedings of the Parliament, summoned by Sir Henry Sidney, as Lord Deputy, which sat in Dublin from January 17 to February 23, 1568. The diary is printed in *Essays relating to Ireland* (1909), by C. Litton Falkiner, from a manuscript in the Cambridge University Library.

James Stanihurst was appointed Speaker of this Parliament. Hooker relates that at one sitting 'great contention did grow' upon a motion by Sir Christopher Barnewall of Turvey, complaining that mayors and sheriffs had elected themselves to Parliament, that members had been returned for towns which had no charters, and especially that a number of 'Englysche'—as Hooker spells the modern 'English'—were disqualified from sitting as they were resident outside the towns and boroughs which they were chosen to represent. The matter was referred to the Lord Deputy. He decided that such sheriffs and mayors

as had returned themselves, and such burgesses as sat for towns that had no corporation 'sholde be dysmyssed out of the House,' but that the English non-resident members 'might syth there lawfully so.' The Anglo-Irish in the Parliament were so dissatisfied with this judgment that they prolonged the contention. The whole House was then summoned before the Lord Deputy, who made a scolding speech and directed the Speaker 'to see punyshment to be donne upon such as dyd dysorder themselfes yn the House.'

Hooker says that the House of Commons was 'more like a bear-baiting of loose persons than an assembly of grave and wise men,' and he tried to conform it to the procedure and manners of Westminster. In his diary he relates how he got into trouble by making an oration in defence of the Royal prerogative and lecturing the Anglo-Irish members on their duty to the State. The speech 'was well lyked, but by some mysliked,' he says. Barnewall and others inveighed against it. Edmund Butler of Callan, 'being in a collar,' as Hooker explains, 'syde if these wordes had been spoken yn any other place than yn this House there be a great many here that they wolde rather have dyed than to have suffred it.' Hooker does not mention it, but I learn from other sources that the House broke up in confusion, and the Englishman, for his better protection, had to be conducted by a body of his friends to the house of Sir Peter Carew. It is gratifying to know that no harm befell him, for we are indebted to him for the sight he has given us of one of the earlier Irish Houses of Commons at work.

Having the passion of the true antiquary and historian for the preservation of documents that threw light upon the annals of a people, Hooker suggested that the Acts of Parliament then on the statute rolls should be printed, and, moreover, he guaranteed to pay the cost himself. In *The Calendar of Irish State Papers* for the years 1515-1574 may be seen the terms of the licence granted to Hooker by the Lord Deputy, the original of which was found in the Carew papers. It is dated March 20, 1568-9. It says that 'whereas divers Parliaments have been holden within Ireland, and divers statutes and Acts made in the same, which laws, not being hitherto put in print, have been altogether turned into oblivion,' a motion submitted by the Speaker of the House of Commons to have them

'imprinted' was agreed to by the Lord Deputy. 'And forasmuch,' it says, 'as John Vowell, *alias* Hooker, gentleman, being one of the said assembly, has offered at his own charges to imprint all the said Statutes and Acts heretofore made, we grant him the sole privilege and licence to imprint the same for ten years next ensuing.' However, nothing appears to have been done to give effect to the patent granted to Hooker. The first collected edition of the Irish Statutes to be printed was brought out in 1621 by Richard Bolton, an English lawyer, who was the Lord Chancellor of Ireland in 1641.

The Acts of Parliament thereafter were printed as they were passed, but printed in such varying types and sizes of papers that in 1762 it was decided to produce them in a complete and uniform edition. The order was made by the Earl of Halifax, Lord Lieutenant, in reply to an address from the House of Lords, and the work, superintended by the Lord Chancellor and judges, was done by Hugh Boulter Primrose Grierson, 'his Majesty's printer general of the kingdom of Ireland.' This edition of the Irish Statutes ran to twenty volumes, folio, and contains the Acts from 1310, the third year of King Edward II, to the Union. The Acts were republished in one volume in 1885, under the authority of the Irish Government, and edited by W. F. Callinan, of the Irish Office, Westminster. But this edition is imperfect, several important Acts being excluded, apparently for the insufficient reason that they were subsequently repealed or superseded.

The Statutes afford much useful information in regard to the varying opinions of the Irish Parliament on political and social questions. But the great mine for exploration by the student who is specially interested in the human side of the legislature and its members lies in the thirty-eight volumes of the Journals of the Commons and the eight volumes of the Journals of the Lords. The Journals were compiled from minutes of the proceedings taken, day by day, by the clerks in both Houses. In the Lords there were 'the Clerk of the Parliaments' and his deputy; in the Commons there were 'the Clerk of the House,' the Clerk-assistant, and the Clerk of the Journals and Records. They all had to take an oath to keep the secrets of the Parliament, and also to make true entry of all motions, orders, and resolutions. In each House the clerks sat at the table wearing wigs and gowns.

Great precautions were taken by Lords and Commons alike to ensure the accuracy of the records thus kept by the clerks. In the House of Lords the minutes of each day's proceedings were read either before the adjournment of the House or at the commencement of the next sitting; and a Committee was appointed every Session to inspect, revise, and correct these minutes before they were finally entered in the Journal-book. The practice of the House of Commons was to print the minutes of each day's proceedings, or 'Votes,' as they were called, and circulate them, next day, among the members. The Votes were first printed in 1692-3, by order of the first Irish Parliament which met after the English Revolution. Every Session, subsequently, the order was renewed in these terms: 'That the Votes of this House be printed, being first perused by Mr. Speaker, and that he do appoint the printing thereof, and that no person but such as he shall appoint do presume to print the same.'

So it happened that the House of Commons was greatly agitated one night in the year 1766 over the question whether an entry which appeared in the Votes circulated that day was false or correct. Going through the Journals for that year, I found that on March 4 it was moved that the Clerk 'had mistaken the sense and order of this House,' in an entry he had made in the Votes, 'touching an entry in the Journal of the 20th April, 1615, and the resolution of the House yesterday relating thereto.' As the House ultimately decided, after a long debate and several divisions, that the entry in the Votes should not appear in the Journals, not even the faintest glimmer of light is thrown by the Journals on the nature or character of the matter in dispute. Could an investigator find himself in a more perplexing and irritating quandary? The key to the heart of the mystery lay in the Votes, and it was my good fortune to discover them in the British Museum Library.

The Votes—it is interesting first to note—contain a warning which was held for many years to be a bar to their republication in the newspapers. It runs: 'By virtue of an Order of the House of Commons I do appoint Abraham Bradley to print these Votes, and that no other person do presume to print the same. John Ponsonby, Speaker.' Then follows the imprint: 'Dublin—Printed by Abraham Bradley, stationer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, and printer to the Honourable House of Commons, at the King's-Arms and Two Bibles in Dame Street, 1766.'

Here, then, is the enlightening, and, as it proves, the historic, entry, in the Votes for March 3, 1766, which so agitated the Commons at their sitting the next day:—

The entry in the Journal of 1615 was called for and read as in the words following:—‘The House of Commons, acknowledging that the sole power and authority to transmit such Bills into England as are to be propounded in Parliament, doth rest in the Lord Deputy and Council, do only desire to be as Remembrances unto his Lordship and the rest.’ Resolved—That the said entry be expunged from the Journals as a Disgrace to Parliament.

The Journals rarely tell how a subject of discussion arose. They give no account of the debate. The recording of results are their sole end. But in that year of 1766, Dr. Charles Lucas asserted by speech in the House of Commons the principle of Irish legislative independence, which had been earlier advocated by Molyneux and Swift in printed pamphlets; and it is obvious that the entry in the Votes was intended as a protest against an acknowledgment by the Irish Parliament of its subserviency to the English Parliament which was made just a century and a half before. Thus enlightened as to the subject in dispute it is possible clearly to follow the course of the debate even from the meagre and somewhat bald entries in the Journals. Evidently, there was a strong rally of the supporters of the Government on March 4, 1766, bent not only on rescinding the protest of the previous day, but also on preventing its entry as a permanent record in the Journals. The Opposition tried to exculpate the Clerk from blame. To the motion put forward by the supporters of the Government that the Clerk had mistaken the sense and order of the House, the Opposition moved an amendment stating that he had published the Votes under the inspection and by the direction of the Speaker. They were defeated by 125 votes to 40. Another amendment to the effect that the Clerk ‘took down no more than the words of the Member upon whose motion the order was founded without debate,’ was also negatived. The original motion was then carried by 105 votes to 50; and by 95 to 40 votes it was further agreed, ‘that the said entry shall be expunged out of the votes, and shall not stand part of the Journals of this House.’

The original purpose of the Journals was the keeping of an official record of the proceedings of Parliament, solely for the knowledge and convenience of the Houses themselves

No thought of the outside public entered into the minds of Commons or Lords. The doings of Parliament were veiled from the people. To publish anything abroad, save the Acts which the people had to obey, and the taxes which they had to pay, would have been then regarded as a profanation of the solemn mysteries of Parliament. Therefore, when the Houses decided to print their Journals for the information of the outside public, a great step was taken by them towards the recognition of the democratic principle—however innocent of such intention the Lords and Commons may have been—that it is from public opinion that parliamentary power derives its authority, and laws their sanction and efficacy. But constitutional questions did not greatly concern me as I turned over the leaves of the Journals. What interested me more was the richness of the material for enabling one to construct a picture of what the Irish Parliament was like at different periods through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Things comic and tragic follow fast on each others heels. Here among the first entries in the opening volume of the Journals of the House of Commons is a great to-do about a contumacious servant of the High Courts, which then met, as well as the Parliament, in Dublin Castle. 'Michael Philpot, key-keeper of the King's Courts, kneeling at the Bar, was charged by Mr. Speaker that he having notice that the Committee were to meet in the Exchequer Court, he obstinately refused to attend. He thereupon submitted himself to the grace of the House, and he was discharged by the general consent of the House.' Then the Commons turned to other affairs. 'The Act for the attainder of the Earl of Tyrone was this day read the second time.' And what a vivid concrete impression is given of the condition of the country, especially the state of the native and Catholic race, by entries made in the year 1662, relating to the first Parliament summoned in Ireland by Charles the Second after the Restoration. In May, one William White, a Catholic, was being buried at Ross, Co. Wexford, and Edward Davis, the sovereign of the borough, or head of the municipality, was seen at the funeral. Complaint was made in the House of Commons that 'Mass was publicly celebrated and other idolatrous practices openly used, all being countenanced by the presence of the sovereign.' A Committee was appointed to

inquire into the matter. They found 'that such superstitious rites and ceremonies were publicly, even at Noon-day, acted in said town, to the great grief and trouble of his Majesty's Protestant subjects,' and so Davis was summoned to the Bar to answer for his conduct. He had to kneel while he made his defence. 'Mr. Davis professed ignorance of what rites were performed, owing to the course of people,' says the Journal, 'and professed to be a good Protestant and detester of Popery. He was admonished by the Speaker to be diligent in the suppression of Popery in future.'

MICHAEL MACDONAGH.

TO-DAY AND THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD

BY REV. E. STEPHENS

THE ministry of the Word has gone hand in hand with the Breaking of Bread ever since a Christian ministry began its beneficent work in the world. True, in that body which alone preserves incorrupt the living tradition of Christianity the first has ever been subordinate to the second. It remained for the Reformers to invert this relationship and to exalt the pulpit by ousting the altar. The result of this topsy-turvydom is seen in the Nonconformist sects of the present day, and indeed in the Establishment itself, if we except the comparatively small sect of advanced Ritualists. Of ritual the Nonconformists have none, and the Anglicans, whilst they have an ordered communion service and set forms of morning and evening prayer, still have not yet succeeded in correcting the idea of their adherents that the pulpit is the centre of their worship. Whilst this condition of affairs continues, and the sermon remains the chief means of arousing the congregation to better things, the sermon will always have to be interesting and fresh. It will have to avoid old shibboleths and adopt new ones, or else empty benches will be the result. The preacher, if he be at the mercy of his deacons, as many Nonconformists are, will be invited to go elsewhere, having lost all power to satisfy his present masters. This fact is a powerful stimulus. A man whose livelihood depends upon his being able to interest his congregation twice a week by giving them the outpourings of his thought upon such subjects as appeal to his audience, will be keenly alive to the necessity of using every available means to equip himself for the task. He will advertise his sermons in the most striking forms; he will ransack current literature for ideas and for words in which to clothe them; he will rush into matters of present controversy to show that 'the Churches are in touch with the life of the Nation,' or that 'they are forming the public conscience.' He will be and do everything; but one thing

he must not do—he must not bore; and one thing he may not be—he may not be insipid or uninspiring, under a heavy penalty.

This system, of course, when it is most successful, is capable of producing speakers of a high order. They are able to gather and keep round their pulpit a large following who look up to them for inspiration in matters not chiefly religious, but also political and social, but when the preacher dies or goes elsewhere the ties between the church and congregation are loosened—the constituency, as it were, is dissolved and new relationships must be formed again. Spurgeon was an instance of this law. The Rev. R. J. Campbell and the fortunes of the City Temple will occur to everyone as a more recent instance still. A writer in the *Manchester Guardian* maintains that such preachers are rarer now than formerly. The new men who hold the Nonconformist pulpits are better scholars, he says, than their predecessors; they are better equipped with a knowledge of letters and theology; they have a better acquaintance with the world and its problems; their speaking is more critical and restrained. So much he counts as gain; but he goes on to mention just two dangers: the first is too great an extension of interests, and the second is too great a pre-occupation with the material relief of the world's ills. The penalty of these is 'the loss of the prophetic and idealist note, which is, after all, the essence of any true ministry.' Such criticism is valuable. The change to which it refers is not one-sided. If the pulpit is different so is the audience.

A generation has sprung up under the impulse of a new education, which has made minds eager for knowledge and receptive of all theories which are thrown broadcast upon the world. Knowledge is wide but not deep: everything is in process of intimate examination and searching discussion. Science, with its problems, has seized hold of the imagination of the masses, opening up vast spaces of inquiry in the field of theology and philosophy. Interest in sociological studies likewise extends; every man has his own theory and his own solution. He wants to hear his theories discussed on satisfactory grounds. Life, too, has become not only complex, but extraordinarily intense. Men live at the highest pitch of fervent enterprise. Their enterprises are not necessarily noble, but they are pursued with all the white heat which a man can command. Audiences of such

men and women are intolerant of prolixity. They require the point to be reached at once and to be dealt with in the fewest possible words. Even parliamentary oratory has been affected by this change. The old grandiloquence has passed under a cloud. It is no longer recognized or practised as an art, although eloquence—that is, the power of moving men by speech—is as potent now as in the days of Grattan or O'Connell: but leisure has gone; gone, too, is the race of statesmen drawn exclusively from the aristocracy and the public schools and Universities. Their place is being taken rapidly by men capable and gifted undoubtedly, but keen to make a career, since a career has not been made for them by accident of birth. They prefer terse and compressed expression to the full, round periods of which Gladstone was so much a master.

Our own Catholic people are like the rest of their generation in the tendencies and build of their mind. The spiritual and material side of life has its problems for them as for others. They are more introspective than their fathers were; they have keener powers of self-analysis; they have enough knowledge to help them to see the force of the difficulties with which the intellectual atmosphere of the present day is laden; they have the same longing for that union with Christ which it is the peculiar gift of the Catholic Church to bestow, but they have to contend against the flesh, like all the children of Adam, and against a more insidious foe, in the shape of temptations against the faith, which no preceding generation has ever felt as men do now. Temptations of this kind do not hang idly in the mind. They have preternatural powers of seeming to blot out all possibility of the supernatural and they leave the fibres of the spiritual life shrivelled as by some scorching fluid. There are in every Catholic congregation a limited number of men and women who are so tempted. Hence why men were never more swayed by the power of the word than they are to-day.

A Catholic will at once ask, have our preachers got this power to sway, and if not, can the power be attained? Let it be said at once that there is no short road to the attainment of it, and false ambitions and false ideals at the beginning may ruin all prospect of its attainment. No one should ever aim at becoming an orator, or what is sometimes too ecstatically called a 'beautiful preacher.' Nature makes her own orators. She sends them into the

world with honey on the lips and the marrow of persuasion in every fold of their being. Such men will declare themselves under the testing process of their life's work. Art and study will develop their gifts—but the orator, like the poet, is born and not made. For a man of ordinary powers the canons of effective speaking are briefly defined : to think clearly, to write clearly, and to speak clearly. Much may be added by way of adornment, but nothing can be taken from them without seriously endangering the whole effort. An ancient critic has declared : 'Dicere enim bene nemo potest nisi prudenter intelligit.' Clearness of thought is essential, because what is said, if it is to be clearly understood by those to whom it is said, must first be grasped by the speaker. No thought can be clearly conveyed which is not clearly conceived. Given clear and adequate conception, then, the expression, whether written or spoken, will be satisfactory. It is essential, therefore, to know what the point is which it is desired to discuss. It should be examined in all its aspects. The arguments for or against it should be clearly marshalled. The statement of them should be so simple as to be within reach of the intelligence of the average man or woman. Difficulties and objections should not be brought forward so prominently or so profusely as to obscure the main idea. Much confusion can be caused by too meticulous or too judicial a handling of the objections to a given theological position. After this process of mapping out the main lines of the argument, if the sermon be written in whole or in part, either roughly or elaborately, the greatest care should be taken to avoid a want of clearness in the statement of the argument.

Clearness does not lie naturally in the genius of English. English is picturesque, vivid, forcible, but its disregard for logical order and its fondness for metaphors entails the loss of that clearness which is the great excellence of French prose, and in a greater degree still, of classical Latin prose. Clearness and logicalness of statement must be achieved by direct effort and with much labour. A priest here has many advantages. He has had a fairly long classical course, during which he has had opened up the storehouses of the masters of all time : for some eight years he has practised assiduously the art of expressing the thoughts of other literatures in the idiom of his own mother-tongue. Time after time, patiently, and not too often successfully, he has

struggled to get the best word in English to convey a baffling phrase of Horace or Virgil. He has been practised in English composition and has read the inimitable masters of English literature, Burke, Newman, Ruskin, Addison, Milton, Shakespeare, and many another. He has thus acquired a high degree of literary culture before passing into the schools of philosophy, and there submitting to the rigorous discipline of scholasticism. As the result of this discipline, he has learned to classify, to divide, to define, to eschew all stuffiness of thought and to pursue to the death all fallacies and error. He has gained an insight into some of the most elemental problems of the human mind. He has theories, and correct theories, on logic, metaphysics, ethics, cosmology, psychology, and natural theology. He can walk with certainty where Plato wandered in error, and he can progress further than Aristotle, though Plato and Aristotle helped to build the roads by which he makes his journey. One need say little of the work done by theology. During the theological course the mind of the student is still being trained in the laws of clear and accurate thought : vaster fields are being opened up to view. All the riches of revelation are being put into his grasp. There is no height he cannot reach, no depth he cannot fathom, with the aid of the science which the Christian Fathers have built up on the foundations of the Apostles and Prophets.

These are the human advantages with which a priest begins the ministry of the Word. Contrast him with the clergy outside the Church. The Anglican clergy are, as a body, gifted with a culture and a refinement of scholarship which we may well envy—but as for a clear grasp of theological truth or a bold statement of it, one seeks for it too often in vain. Hence their sermons are often eloquent and models of fine writing, but as statements of theological truth they leave much to be desired, partly from the initial vagueness of their principles, partly from bewilderment in the controversies of the hour, and partly from timidity, lest too blunt a statement should alienate any of their hearers. Of philosophical training, if we except some logic and ethics, they have had none, nor have they a philosophical system. Their theological training is not long, and certainly not systematic. Of the Nonconformists we have already spoken. Their general level is far below that of the clergy of the Establishment.

The priest, therefore, stands on a higher plane of natural

advantages than either of his rivals. Moreover, his training in college has made of him a man whose sole aspirations are of another world than this. He has the mysterious power born of sacrifice. He knows the meaning of the renunciation of all things for Christ. It cannot be said of him, as Anthony Trollope said of the clergy of his Church, that at the age of twenty-three, after years of boating, cricketing, and wine parties, he was sent out to stand high above the heads of a submissive crowd of men and women who have approached near to the grave and have felt, by intimate trial, the need of sure guidance in the things of God. Not so the Catholic priest. There is no need for him to seek out phrases that will not jar upon the susceptibilities of possible agnostics. He speaks like his Master, with power. His training in moral theology has given him a rare knowledge of human nature and his daily reading brings him into intimate intercourse with the masters of the spiritual life, St. Francis of Sales, St. John of the Cross, St. Teresa, and à Kempis. A knowledge of Catholic Ascetics made Newman's Oxford sermons such marvels to his generation, and his acting upon them made him a Catholic. If the studies preliminary to the priesthood are endured perfunctorily it is no just subject of complaint that they have not done all that they might have done under the circumstances.

Before any system is condemned, the question should be asked and answered honestly : 'Did I make the best of it ?' There seems less point, on reflection like this, in the charge sometimes urged by some that they were not taught how to preach. In point of fact, the whole of one's course is or should be a teaching how to preach. The rules for good preaching were said to be clear thinking, clear writing, and clear speaking. Gifts of temperament are gifts, not acquisitions. No amount of teaching could ever make a Father Tom Burke. If we accept the teaching of Bishop Hedley, all the classic treatises on rhetoric are for born orators, not for those who aim at lower flights. Still, though one may not take in the full sweep of an orator's powers, everyone can profit in his degree by paying attention to the elementary laws of good writing and good speaking. This attention should be life-long. Any system which attempts to train a young preacher should give him a knowledge, more or less rudimentary, of the divisions of a speech or of a sermon, and of the proper arrangement and marshalling of the line of argument : it should teach him the elementary

rules for the use of gestures. Too many gestures are dangerous. Human language, even from the lips of its greatest masters, is unequal to the task of conveying the thoughts with which a speaker's heart is full. A poet like Virgil will convey his meaning by the music of his rhythm; an orator will open the sluices of his pent-up emotions by gestures as ample as the occasion demands. Apart from thoughts, gestures, if too numerous or too passionate, are meaningless. They are not an aim in themselves; they are a means, and are intended to carry off amplitude of thought, language and emotion.

Some lessons also should be given as to the proper way to stand, though even here artificial attitudes should be avoided. Most important of all is the art of speaking distinctly. A congregation will forgive much if only they can hear distinctly. The art of pronouncing final consonants and of not slurring over intermediate syllables is not cultivated as it should be: provincialisms, and even more glaring errors, are not so annoying as the utter loss of the last part of the word, for which the ear is waiting and without which the mind loses the sense of the whole sentence.

The question of the immediate preparation of sermons is one that needs careful treatment. It is impossible to be too emphatic in pointing out the dangers of mounting a pulpit without adequately working out beforehand the exact lines of thought to be followed, if not the language in which the thoughts are to be expressed. In a charge delivered to his clergy in 1909, the Anglican Bishop of Liverpool gave the following advice:—

Our distractions are innumerable and there is serious danger of our time for reading and thought becoming curtailed. It is a danger against which we must all guard. Even in the busiest life much can be done by resolution and method. Study is sometimes neglected through lack of inclination to study, and because it is much harder to think than it is to write letters or to attend a committee meeting. A steadfast resolution to read for a certain time every day is half way to victory. The want of method is equally to blame. If a specified time be set apart and zealously guarded; if our odd moments are used to master some good book, lying ready to hand, our preaching would become permanently enriched. The pulpit had never more power than at present. Sermons are often held in slight esteem by their hearers, because they are so lightly regarded by the preacher himself.

This is an admirable statement of the case and the insistence on constant reading is practical and sound. No mind is so large a reservoir of thought that it needs no

replenishing. The springs that open on the hills need the rains of heaven to make them flow down the hillsides and flood the valleys. Yet, year in and year out, a priest will have to preach the same truths to the same congregation. The difference between the fertile and the barren preacher lies in this that the former comes with fresh thoughts and fresh language to the old themes, approaches his subjects by new paths, and deals with it in the light of the relationship it has to the problems of the moment. The results are worth the effort. In that solemn but disappointing book, *The Life of Bishop Wilberforce*, there is a long extract, in which he gives his ideas on the preparation of sermons. The whole is a perfect statement of the evangel of good preaching and will bear quoting :—

Immediate preparation, prayer, patient labour to secure for our discourses depth, solidity, and order. Remember the somewhat caustic words, ‘the sermon which has cost little is worth just what it cost.’ To secure thought and preparation begin, whenever it is possible, the next Sunday’s sermon at least on the preceding Monday. Choose the subject according to the people’s needs and your own power. Let it be as much as possible resolvable into a single proposition. Having chosen the subject meditate upon it as deeply as you can. Consider first how to state correctly the theological formula which it involves; then how to arrange the parts so as to convince the hearer’s understanding. Think next how you can move his affections and so win his will to accept it.

Having thus the whole before you, you may proceed to its composition. And in doing this, if any thoughts strike you with peculiar power, secure them at once. Do not wait until, having written or composed all the rest, you come in order to them. Such burning thoughts burn out. Fix them whilst you can. I would say, never, if you can help it, compose except with a fervent spirit: whatever is languidly composed is lifelessly received. Rather stop and try whether reading, meditation, and prayer will not quicken the spirit than drive on heavily when the chariot wheels are taken off. So the mighty masters of our art have done. Bossuet never set himself to compose his great sermons without first reading chapters of Isaiah and portions of St. Gregory Nazianzen to kindle his own spirit. In some such way set yourself to compose, and until you have preached for many years, I would say write at least one sermon weekly. Study with especial care all statements of doctrine, to be clear, particular and accurate. Do not labour too much to give too great ornament or polish to your sermons. They often lose their strength in such refining processes. If you see that a word is not understood, vary it: that an appeal is reaching some heart, press it home. If you have the gift, after having written your sermon carefully, make short notes and preach from these. This will help you greatly to shew in your manner that you feel what you say—the first and the chiefest rule for making it felt by others.

It would be difficult to press in shorter compass so rich an abundance of good advice. A few points of criticism

may be allowed. It is not usually practicable, nor indeed desirable, for a priest to attempt sermon preparation on Monday morning, after the exhaustion of a long week-end. Bishop Wilberforce never knew the demands of a Saturday night in the confessional, followed by a long fast on the Sunday morning; still the preparation will be all the better the sooner it is begun. Bishop Hedley is in entire agreement with the advisability of choosing a subject resolvable into a single proposition. His principle was 'to divide, if division was necessary, a small field and not a large one. Divide a field and not a country. Divide vain-glory and not pride: the prayer of petition and not prayer in general: Bethlehem and not the Incarnation.'¹

Bossuet's testimony to the inspiring powers of Isaias will be that of every other preacher, let him be as humble as Bossuet was great. The Hebrew prophets had the tradition of a race who spoke with God. They were steeped in the atmosphere of the Divine Presence and the sound of God's Voice was ever in their ears. The vision of His glory opened before their eyes. Hence, in all that they wrote or spoke, God streamed from lips and pen; how we know not, we can only feel the fact, we cannot explain it. One of the secrets of Newman's charm as a preacher is the consummate art with which he availed himself of the treasures of quotations from Scripture. Many of his finest effects have been produced by an apt allusion which lit up the dullest and greyest of truths with the radiance of the vision of Psalmist and Prophet. So, too, Bishop Hedley, and that truly Celtic orator, the late Father Maturin. Isaias is particularly helpful, because the dominant features of his prophetic utterances are so mightily dependent on the divinity and Sacred Humanity of Our Lord—His mission as the man of Sorrows—on the Church, the Vision of Jerusalem, and on the light that shines upon it. How can any man's mind remain dull and torpid when he reads of these sublime verities in the language of one of the greatest poets of all times, as well as a prophet of God?

Many will be found to disagree with the writing of sermons. The rival theories make a fine point for debating. A written sermon, if it sometimes necessitates disregarding a passing inspiration, lest the thread be broken, is at any rate a safeguard against repetition, platitude, and

¹ *Lex Levitarum*, p. 17.

anti-climax. It does enable the preacher to finish and come down. It is something to ensure freedom from the embarrassment of the preacher whose thoughts are exhausted, but who knows not how to bring his sermon to a close. His embarrassment is great; that of the congregation is greater. Even those who possess the gift of ready utterance will not seldom admit that they would have preached better if they had less facility of expression. Words as a rule are more abundant than thought. Thoughts lie hid deep in the mind. To uproot them and dislodge them needs much labour and sweat.

How often can a man say that he has adequately measured his thoughts? He can break off chips and larger fragments, and if he be a sluggard he will be content. The mind of such a man is like a quarry, whose riches have been prematurely abandoned. Its surface is rugged, but its depths are unopened and never will be exhausted. This need not imply a sermon laden with too great a burden of thought, but every sermon ought to suggest an ample reservation of much more that might be said, did the preacher so choose. Adverse criticism of the writing of sermons may be disarmed by the advice given to preach from notes, after the sermon has been read and re-read many times in preparation. Literary artists, who are careful above all things to keep an exact balance between thought and expression, will avoid even this compromise: the ordinary preacher in all probability will find that the needs of his congregation can be met by it. It will secure him from the faults inherent in insufficient preparation, from tautology, from vagueness, and from slipshod phrases, whilst it will allow him to alter his line if the fervour of the moment suggests something more immediately apt and telling.

It is not possible to write all the sermons that are to be preached—some kinds of sermons cannot be written—but experience will show that the preacher who prepares oftenest and most carefully, writing and re-writing until his thoughts are satisfactorily shaped, who takes the greatest pains to keep his mind as fresh and as open as his reading will permit, will reap in the pulpit, when sudden emergencies arise, the full effect of his self-discipline. Over and above writing comes reading. The field to be covered is vast—as vast as the expanse of the human mind: theology, philosophy, apologetics, history, economics, with all their

various divisions and subdivisions, will provide harvests to store up in the granary of the priest's mind. But rich as the harvests may be, let it not be doubted that the demand upon the store will be great and incessant. The growth of human thought means the growth of human difficulties, and woe be to us if we are unable to meet them. All this involves labour and sacrifice. Yet the priest and preacher is the authentic bearer of the commission of Christ to go out and teach. He is a schoolmaster to bring little ones to Christ. To achieve this divine ambition nothing should be too high in aim or too noble in conception, if by means of it he can carry out the purpose of his Master, whose feeble instrument he is.

EDWARD STEPHENS.

NOTES AND QUERIES

THEOLOGY

THE NEW REGULATIONS ON PREACHING

A RECENT decree of the Consistorial Congregation,¹ embodying the Catholic doctrine on preaching and enforcing rules for its application, is of more than ordinary interest. It will involve additional work for Bishops and Religious Superiors, and confer on them certain rights that they have never had before, or, at least, have never exercised. And on the ordinary priest it will impose restrictions that are quite new in ecclesiastical life.

Two other documents prepared the way. One was an Encyclical of the Holy Father, dated the 15th of June last, and addressed to 'the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops and other local Ordinaries in communion with the Holy See.' In it he recalled the maxims on the subject furnished by the New Testament and the Fathers of the Church, deplored the lower standards adopted by many preachers of our day, and called upon those whom he addressed to effect a reformation in current methods, by carefully selecting those qualified to preach, rejecting the unsuitable, and exercising their authority generally on the lines he indicated. His portrait of the 'babbling declaimer' was anything but flattering :—

What are they chiefly inspired by? Some by a desire for empty glory; and, in order to satisfy it, 'they prefer the lofty theme to the appropriate, arousing an admiration for themselves in people of weak intelligence, whose salvation they do nothing to promote. They are ashamed to talk of plain and humble doctrines, lest it might be thought they knew nothing else' and, though it was from the humble character of His audience that Jesus Christ proved He was the Messiah who was expected—'the poor have the Gospel preached to them'—what struggles do not these men make to have glory reflected on their sermons by the celebrated cities or the first-rank churches in which they preach! And, since in God's revelation there are things that make corrupt human nature shudder, they carefully avoid all of them, and deal with matters in which, if we except the place of delivery, there is nothing whatever sacred. Often, in the very middle of a discourse on eternal truths, they lapse into politics, especially anything in that line that makes an intense appeal to the audience. Their whole ambition, indeed, would seem to be to please their

¹ It is dated the 28th June, and was published four days later. The full text may be seen in our 'Documents' (*infra*, pp. 336 et seq.).

hearers and satisfy the bent of those denounced by St. Paul as 'itching ears.' Hence the gestures, neither calm nor grave, usually associated with the stage or public platform; the exaggerated softening and tragic heightening of the voice; the style of language suggestive of the daily newspaper; the multitude of views borrowed, not from the Scriptures or the Fathers, but from the writings of impious men and non-Catholics; the volubility of utterance that stuns the ear and excites the admiration of their hearers, without conveying anything profitable that they can bring home with them. It is marvellous how misguided these men are. Let them have the ignorant applause that they worked for sacrilegiously: is it really any reward for their labour, when they are faced with the contempt of the judicious and, more serious still, with the strict and terrible judgment of Christ? ¹

We may say that the description applies to very few priests in this country: we may conjecture, too, that Continental displays, of which we have heard details in recent times, represented the abuses aimed at in the new regulations. But all that makes little difference. General laws have now been passed to prevent the recurrence of these disedifying spectacles, and there is always the possibility that similar scenes might occur anywhere. And, as we always knew and are told again in the new Code (c. 21), 'laws passed to provide against a general danger bind, even though there be no danger in an individual case.'

The second document referred to was the section on the subject in the new Code itself (1337-48), which, though not published, was, of course, in existence at the time the decree was issued. It states in brief form the regulations given in detail in the decree, and adds a number of prescriptions about which the decree says nothing. As will be seen from the text, the decree is to be put into force by the Ordinaries at once, whereas the Code as a whole is not to operate till Pentecost Sunday, May 19, 1918.² Strictly speaking, therefore, some of the new laws on preaching are not so urgent as others. But in practice, we may take it, the whole section will be accepted as soon as the Ordinaries have, in accordance with the Pope's injunction, applied the decree in their respective dioceses.

Faculties are now required for preaching. If a sermon is to be preached to the professed members or novices of an exempt clerical Order, or to those who, as servants, pupils, guests or patients, live in the Institution day and night, the Superior grants the faculty either to his own subjects, or, after they have been declared suitable by their Superior or Ordinary, to outsiders, Religious or secular. In all other cases, whether the preacher be Religious or secular, and whether the Church belongs to an Order or not, the competent authority is the Ordinary of the place. He must not, however, without grave reason, refuse the faculty to a Religious presented by his own Superior, nor recall it when granted, especially from a whole community: but, on the other hand, when he does grant it, the Religious preacher still requires

¹ *Acta Ap. Sedis*, v. 9, n. 7, pp. 311-12.

² Preface to the Code, p. 8.

the permission of his own Superior. And the prohibition against revoking faculties is to be understood as applying only to a case in which no evidence of defective qualities has arisen. If there be such evidence in connexion with any preacher, Religious or secular, the Ordinary or Superior is bound to revoke; if the case be doubtful, he must remove the doubt by securing convincing evidence in the preacher's favour; and, if he does revoke, the appeal that is allowed has no suspensive effect (Code, 1338-40).

In the Code it is stated that the Ordinary or Superior is not to grant the faculty, unless the candidate's good character is established, and his knowledge and powers of delivery tested by examination. The decree, it will be noticed, provides for exceptional cases, in which the Ordinary may dispense with an examination and rest content with evidence procured from other sources (II. 16). It also makes it clear that the faculty granted may be restricted to whatever extent the Ordinary thinks proper, whether as regards time, class of sermon, or other conditions (15). And, in particular, there is a stringent prohibition against the Ordinary's granting a preaching diploma, either for ordinary working purposes or as a token of his high esteem (17).

From the Code one would form the impression that all priests require these special faculties. The Consistorial, again, is the bearer of a milder message. Parish priests are exempt. They have got the power already in virtue of their office, in somewhat the same way as they have jurisdiction for the hearing of confessions. And the Canon Theologian shares in the privilege to some extent.

But for all others, Religious or secular, when there is question of preaching to the ordinary faithful, the special faculties are necessary. The persons on whom the obligation rests of securing these faculties are enumerated (5). The preacher himself is not called upon to act: it is the first dignitary of the Chapter, or the Regular Superior, or the parish priest, or the confraternity chaplain, or the priest in charge of the church, according to the circumstances. But the preacher is not free from all responsibility. If he accepts an invitation and preaches, knowing that these regulations have not been complied with, he becomes liable to the same penalties, even suspension if the Ordinary so decides, as may be incurred by those who issue the invitation. The petition from those mentioned must be presented to the Ordinary two months at least before the sermon is to be preached, unless the Ordinary himself arranges for a shorter period in view of certain classes of sermons or preachers. The regulation is especially strict when the preacher belongs to another diocese. The faculty must be given in writing, and only after favourable information has been received from his own Ordinary, who is bound *sub gravi* to give a true and accurate account of his qualifications. If the information furnished in this way is not considered satisfactory, the Ordinary of the place refuses the faculty, and is not bound to answer for his action to anyone but God (12).

In connexion with these arrangements, a slight discrepancy in terminology will be noticed. The concession by an Ordinary to an extra-

diocesan is sometimes referred to as a 'faculty' ¹—the same word as is used of concessions to subjects—and sometimes as mere 'permission' ² (*licentia*). If we take these passages in conjunction with the second and fourth chapters of the decree, the state of things would seem to be this: Any Ordinary may, granted the prescribed conditions, confer the 'faculty,' but a further 'permission' for sermons addressed to the faithful generally is required from the Ordinary of the place where the sermon is preached.

The rules about the sermon itself will be read with interest. Prayer and study form the proximate preparation. If a preacher is anxious to discuss matters that, though suited to the house of God, are not essentially sacred, he must get permission from the local Ordinary: and the permission is not to be granted except the latter, after mature consideration, decides that the policy has to be adopted. Politics are absolutely barred—as they have been in this country for many years past by the Statutes of the Synod of Maynooth. Funeral panegyrics are allowed only with the explicit consent of the Ordinary, who may insist on seeing the manuscript first. The statements of profane authors, especially of heretics, apostates and infidels, are to be employed with the greatest moderation and caution, and the words of living persons never—by which is meant, as is clear from the nature of the case and is suggested by the context, the words of living persons belonging to the classes mentioned. The custom of using newspapers or leaflets to advertise a preacher before the sermon, or to draw attention to his merits when the sermon is over, is absolutely condemned, no matter what the pretext: and the Ordinary is to see that no such custom is to come into existence for the future. Finally, several quotations from St. Jerome are employed to inculcate the lessons that we might have been prepared for after reading the Pope's denunciation of the present-day declaimers.

A remonstrance from the Bishop will be sufficient punishment for the first or second violation of the rules mentioned in the last paragraph, provided the violation be slight and not likely to be repeated. If the latter conditions are not fulfilled, the Bishop must, 1°, withdraw the faculty, temporarily or permanently, from his own subject or from a Religious on whom he has conferred it; 2°, withdraw permission for preaching in his diocese from an extra-diocesan or a Religious who got his faculty from some one else; and at the same time inform the preacher's own Ordinary, the person who granted the faculty, and, in the more serious cases, the Holy See itself. He may also, and in some cases ought to, interrupt the sermon, when the violation of the regulations is serious. He may withdraw the faculty, at least for a definite time and place, from anyone who, whether through his own fault or not, has lost his public reputation. And, in order to keep himself informed on matters essential to the due fulfilment of these obligations, he will appoint a Vigilance Committee, and, in certain cases, will insist on information from the Vicars-Forane and the parish priests.

The regulations on the training of students are, so far as we have

¹ Decree, i. 9.

² Code, 1341, § 1.

any experience or information, fully complied with already in our Irish colleges. The special capacities of each student are to be studied and reported upon to the Ordinary : and the course of training is to continue in after-life. On the mission, the young priests are to be employed first in the lower and less difficult departments, and a yearly examination, oral and written, may be prescribed if the Ordinary so decides.

Finally, from the Code we gather a few extra points. Preaching faculties are, as a rule, to be granted only to priests and deacons : to other clerics, however, when the Ordinary allows it on reasonable grounds : to the laity never (1342). The Ordinary may preach in any church in his diocese, exempt or not. Except in large cities, the Bishop may prohibit sermons in the local churches while he is preaching to the people himself, or having, for some special cause of public interest, a sermon preached in his presence (1343). A parish priest cannot fulfil his obligation by permanent deputy, except for reasonable cause approved by the Ordinary ; but, on these same conditions, the sermon may be omitted on some of the more solemn feasts (1344). A wish is expressed that, at all Masses attended by the faithful on feasts of precept in public churches and oratories, there should be a short discourse on the Gospel or on some portion of Christian doctrine : if the Ordinary sanctions this wish by a law of his own, all priests, secular and Religious, are bound by the regulation (1345). And the faithful are to be earnestly exhorted to attend sermons frequently (1348).

It will be seen (I. 2) that 'no one can *validly or lawfully* select or invite any preacher even for his own church,' except in conformity with the regulations prescribed—which means, we take it, that not only is it wrong to issue such an invitation, but that the invitation, when issued, has no more effect, in the way of furnishing a basis for a contract, than if it came from some one who has no authority whatever.

TRANSFERENCE OF MASS HONORARIA

REV. DEAR SIR,—May I trespass on your indulgence to answer a moral question for me? Suppose a priest gets 100 Masses to be said, according to the law, within six months, and that, through inability to say them, or through friendship, he decides to give them to others, say to ten—and allows them, each, four or five months, aye, even longer, to say them, provided that the 100 Masses are said within the six months—is he justified in so acting? Some are of opinion that he is quite justified, as the Masses will be all said within the time prescribed, whilst others stoutly maintain the contrary, and for the following reasons:

1°. According to the new legislation, ten at least of these Masses should be said within a month; though a priest can transfer Masses, he must do so according to the wish of the donor; and, when he does so, he must make sure that no detriment accrues to the spiritual or temporal interests of the donor; which would seem to be the case if the Masses are *all* put back for four or five months, or longer.

2°. In every case, the intention of the donor should be sought out and complied with—either the implicit or the explicit. Now though in

this case the explicit intention of the donor may not be known or expressed, still his implicit intention, one would think, is quite clear and manifest. For we must suppose that a donor, with any fair amount of common sense, would far prefer to have the Masses said for his intention *gradatim*, from month to month, than to have them said *in globo*, at the end of four or five months. That is to say, we should suppose that to be the implicit intention of any ordinary donor, of any man in his senses. *Quaeso, quid sentis?*

SUBSCRIBER.

We are in full agreement with 'Subscriber' in everything he has stated. It seems to us quite absurd to suppose that the priest's action in transferring the *honoraria* can have any effect on the obligation attached to them by the definite laws of the Church. As soon as he accepts the *honoraria*, a contract is concluded between himself and the donor, and that contract must be carried out strictly, according to the terms imposed either by the donor or, if the latter says nothing expressly or implicitly, by authoritative Church legislation. Whether the priest fulfils the contract himself or has it fulfilled by deputy does not affect the matter in the least. The obligation is attached to the *honoraria*, and no private individual in the world—the donor, of course, excepted—has any power to modify it in the slightest. These are the principles on other contracts, and we fail to see how, in connexion with this special contract, anyone can introduce any peculiar principle of his own that would stand examination for a moment.

There can be no justification, therefore, for the policy outlined in 'Subscriber's' opening paragraph. If the priest merely said the 100 Masses within six months—without saying any during the first month, etc.—he would not fulfil his obligation. The donor of 100 *honoraria* is surely in as favourable a position as if he were the donor of one: and in the latter case, he would be entitled to have the Mass said within the month, and further postponement would be a distinct violation of Church regulations. The priest has no right himself to postpone celebration in the manner indicated. And, as we learned long ago in our Philosophy course, and have never found reason since to deny, a man cannot give another what he has not got himself.

The distribution must, therefore, be made in such a way that some one at least of the recipients will discharge the obligations attaching to the separate months.

The new legislation does not say that '10 at least should be said within a month.' That is only a canonist's comment.

NOTE.—We regret that we must hold over another query from 'Subscriber' and several communications from other quarters.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

CANON LAW

LAW ON PREACHING PECULIAR TO CERTAIN DIOCESES—
NATURE OF THE OBLIGATION IT IMPOSES

REV. DEAR SIR,—In some dioceses of Ireland there is a law obliging a priest to preach three Sundays in the month under pain of suspension *ipso facto*. Now, it sometimes happens, as it did last July, that there are five Sundays in the month, and the question arises, is a priest bound to begin the first Sunday and preach the two Sundays following also when he foresees that he will not be able to fulfil his duty if he waits till the last three, because, v.g., he has to go on vacation, say, after the third?

Some hold that he would not be bound to begin on the first Sunday, because, they say, the law has the appearance of a penal one, and should be strictly interpreted, and hence does not bind until the last moment, when it is beyond the power of the priest to fulfil the law.

Others maintain that he is bound to begin on the first Sunday and finish his obligation on the third, as he will have time to do so, because, foreseeing the impediment, if he defers it until after the third, he is bound to *anticipate* being subject to and gripped by the law from the first Sunday.

The case seems similar to that of the Paschal Communion, which, if a person foresees at the beginning of the time that he will be unable to fulfil it later on, he is bound to communicate when he can. The same holds good with regard to the hearing of Mass on a Sunday. If on that morning a man wants to go on a journey, and he finds he must start before the last Mass, say at eleven o'clock, he is bound to hear an earlier one, say at eight o'clock. It may be said that the censure makes a difference in the case of preaching, but the manifest reply to that is, that there is also a censure *ferenda sententia* in the case of non-fulfilment of the Paschal duty. And it may be added that the law of preaching is not a penal but an ecclesiastical one, and the censure is placed only to ensure its fulfilment.

Your decision will be thankfully received by me.

A SUBSCRIBER.

We agree with the second view mentioned by our correspondent, viz., that the priest is bound to discharge his obligation in the early portion of the month, if he foresees an impediment to its fulfilment in the later. It is a general principle that temporal obligations, such as this, are to be complied with immediately, if it be foreseen that their fulfilment will afterwards become impossible.¹ The reason is manifest. A law of its very nature binds those who are subject to it to take reasonable precautions to obtain its fulfilment; and this condition would certainly not be complied with were it neglected until a period when its fulfilment became impossible.

¹ 'Itaque si hoc tempus in lege definitum est, lex intra id tempus implenda erit, nempe ex quo cessit usque dum venerit dies. Nihilominus si medio tempore imminet aliquod impedimentum perinde habendum erit, ac si eo superveniente dies venerit.'—D'Annibale, *Summ. Th. Mor.*, vol. i. n. 167.

The analogy made by our correspondent with the obligations of Paschal Communion and hearing Mass on Sundays and Holidays is very appropriate: these bear a close resemblance to the obligation under discussion and follow fully the principle which we have enunciated. In fact, as far as we are aware, there is only one obligation of this nature in which the application of the principle is subject to any doubt; and that is the obligation of reciting the Divine Office. If an impediment to the recitation of the Divine Office in the afternoon is foreseen, all are agreed that Matins, Lauds, and the Small Hours should be said in the forenoon. Although most writers maintain that Vespers and Compline should be also anticipated, a minority hold that this is not the case, as the rubrics prescribes the afternoon as the time for the recitation of this portion of the Office.¹ The trouble about this particular obligation is that there are two prescriptions in regard to time: one commanding the whole office to be said within the twenty-four hours; and the other assigning particular portions of it to different parts of the day. The correct solution of the difficulty is immaterial to the present case, as there is no strict analogy between them. In the law under consideration there is only one regulation in regard to time: the sermons are not attached to particular Sundays in the month.

The rule that penal laws are to be strictly interpreted is not applicable in the present case. Such a rule is very useful when doubts have to be cleared up. The principle, however, in regard to the fulfilment of temporal obligations is quite certain.

The distinction which our correspondent, in the latter portion of his query, makes between penal and ecclesiastical laws is not correct. The two classes are not mutually exclusive, penal being merely a division of ecclesiastical laws. The law in which we are interested is undoubtedly penal, and it is, of course, also ecclesiastical.

STUDY DURING THE NOVITIATE

REV. DEAR SIR,—I have heard that during my absence abroad a decree, or its equivalent, was issued regarding the amount of time to be spent daily in secular studies by novices. I have also heard that a later decree increased the number of hours. Will you kindly state the present legislation on this point, where it may be found, and if it is obligatory in Institutes devoted to education.

SUBSCRIBER.

The only recent decree on this matter, of which we are aware, was published by the Congregation of Religious on the 27th August, 1910; it is to be found, amongst other places, in the second volume of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, page 732. Previous to the publication of this decree formal study

¹ 'Qui tempore pomeridiano impeditus est, saltem tenetur mane eas horas dicere, quae secundum hodiernam praxim in choro mane jam dici solent, i.e., totum officium usque ad Nonam inclusive (imo tempore Quadragesimae etiam Vesperas). Plerique etiam tenent eum debere quolibet anni tempore sub gravi etiam Vesperas et Completorium recitare . . . at num haec rigorosa obligatio existat, merito videtur dubitandum esse.'—Lehmkuhl, *Th. Mor.*, vol. ii. n. 628, 5.

was, as a general rule, entirely forbidden, if the novitiate lasted only one year. If, however, the novitiate was of two years' duration, some study might be undertaken during the second year. It will suffice to refer to the *Normae*. After an enumeration of the various works in the performance of which the first year of the novitiate must be passed, and amongst which study finds no place, § 73 continues: 'In secundo autem novitiatus anno, semper sub directione et vigilantia magistrae studiis vel aliis operibus instituti moderate vacare poterunt, sed in ipsa novitiatus domo, et non extra eam, nisi graves rationes aliter suadent.'

The decree already referred to has considerably modified this discipline. For the convenience of our correspondent, and also of others who may not have an opportunity of reading the decree itself, we shall give briefly its main provisions.

1. Novices are to study in private one hour each day with the exception of Sundays and holidays.

2. These studies are to be under the direction of the Master or Vice-Master of Novices, or some professor of literature. It is the duty of whoever undertakes the direction of studies to instruct the novices in class not more than three times each week and for an hour each time distinct, however, from the hour devoted to private study.

3. The study is not to be regarded as merely a work of mortification, but as study in the real sense of the term from which intellectual progress is to be derived, and is to be directed by the Superior in such a way that this end will be obtained. The nature of the study to be undertaken will depend a good deal on the duties which the novices will be afterwards called upon to fulfil as determined by the rules and constitution of each individual Order or Congregation. The study of the vernacular, and of Latin and Greek as circumstances permit, is, however, recommended. Written exercises are also declared to be of great utility.

4. The director of the studies is bound to take note of the diligence and progress of each novice and to give a written testimony of them to the Superior-General or Provincial at the expiration of the novitiate.

We are unaware of any more recent legislation on this subject, and we have searched the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* pretty closely; we presume, therefore, that there is none.

Institutes devoted to education are certainly bound by this decree, as there is no exempting clause in their favour.

SELECTING DEPUTIES FOR GENERAL CHAPTERS

REV. DEAR SIR,—The following is an extract from a decree, 'Datum Romae ex aedibus S. C. Propa. Fide, die 24th Aprilis, An. 1906.

'FR. G. M. CARD. GOTTI, *Praef.*

'LUIGI VECCHIA, *Secret.*

'Ad tramitem legum canonicarum, inde a die indictionis Capituli Generalis singulis religiosis sodalibus machinari omnino interdicatur ad aliquem confratrem excludendum ab officio deputati ad Capitulum Generale: ac pari ratione interdicatur ne quis ad praedictum deputati officium aut se aut quemlibet alium eligendum moliat.

Which, in your opinion, does *omnino* refer to—*machinari* or *interdicitur*? What, for the purposes of this decree, is the exact force of the terms, *machinari omnino interdicitur*, and *moliatur*?

The vast majority of my *confrères* would feel most grateful for a short statement explaining what is allowed to each Religious to do, and what he is forbidden to do, in correspondence having for object the making of representations to *confrères* as to the suitability or otherwise of members who are spoken of as likely deputies.

DOUBTFUL ONE.

Omnino, in our opinion, qualifies *interdicitur*; the point, however, is not very material to the interpretation of the decree.

The term *machinari* usually implies the use of underhand, illicit contrivances, and we have no doubt that the word has this meaning here. This decree involves a restriction of liberty, and consequently should be strictly interpreted. The term *moliri*, too, has sometimes a similar implication; and, on account of the restriction of liberty involved and the parallelism with *machinari*, we are convinced that it is the one intended.

In general terms, then, it may be said that this decree forbids each member of the Order to scheme or intrigue either for the exclusion of a fellow-member from the office of deputy or for the appointment of himself or some other member.

An enumeration of all the various forms which correspondence might take in connexion with these appointments would be very difficult and by no means necessary. It will suffice to deal with a few of the principal.

1. We think it would be quite lawful for a Religious to seek advice by letter from a *confrère* as to the suitability or otherwise of an individual or individuals for the office of deputy, and this *confrère* would be quite free to give his honest views on the individual or individuals named, in reply.

2. Neither do we think it opposed to the prohibition contained in this decree to send a list of suitable candidates to *confrères*.

3. If a Religious knows that a certain candidate has certain defects which would render him quite unsuitable for the office of deputy, he is, in our opinion, at liberty to communicate his views to a *confrère* or *confrères*.

4. To make false representations with a view to procuring or preventing the election of an individual or individuals is, of course, quite unlawful.

A WILL CASE

REV. DEAR SIR,—May I trouble you for an answer to the following questions in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD: Some few years ago a *Parochus* bequeathed by will a certain sum of money to his niece, which was to be given to her on condition of her becoming a nun. She entered a convent and was professed in the month of October, 1915. She received her legacy, which was duly handed over to the Superioress of the convent. This nun has recently left the convent and returned to her parental

home. The *Parochus* in question bequeathed the residue of his property to the Catholic poor of the parish in which he lived and died. The questions to which an answer is required are as follows :—

1. Did this nun, who left her convent through no fault on the part of those in authority, lose all right to the money paid by her when entering ?

2. If not, is it to be given back to her as her absolute property, after all necessary expenses for maintenance, etc., have been deducted, or rather should it be distributed amongst the residuary legatees—the Catholic poor ?

VICARIUS.

The difficulty, in this particular case, is to determine whether the testator's intention was that the money should be given absolutely to his niece when she became a nun, or merely conditionally on the condition, viz., that she should remain a Religious. The words of the will, as far as we can make them out from our correspondent's letter, indicate that the money was to be given her absolutely : there is no evidence of any condition having been placed. Besides, it is a rather rare thing for a nun, once she has been professed, to leave the religious state, and hence it is quite unlikely that the testator had this possibility before his mind or that his intention was influenced by it. We conclude, therefore, that the bequest was absolute.

The position of the nun in regard to the money will differ in accordance as the Institution of which she was a member was an Order in the strict sense, with solemn vows, or a Congregation, with merely simple vows. In strict Orders the dowry of members becomes the property of the Institution, when profession is made, and hence there is no strict obligation to restore it when a nun leaves the Order. In certain cases, however, claims of equity will arise; and hence canonists point out that the Holy See is accustomed to command, at least, a partial restoration of the dowry in the following cases : (1) When the Order itself has been to blame for the departure of the nun ; (2) when she leaves for the purpose of joining another Order ; (3) when she is otherwise unable to support herself.¹

In Congregations the dowry does not become the property of the Institution at profession, but only at death; and hence, if any member leaves, she is still the owner of her dowry. Some compensation may, however, be due to the Congregation on account of expenses.²

We may now proceed to answer directly our correspondent's queries.

1. If she belonged to a strict Order, she lost all strict right to her dowry ; but, in accordance with what we have already said, the Order may be sometimes bound in equity to at least a partial restitution. If she belonged to a Congregation, she retains full right to her dowry, but she may be bound to make compensation for expenses undertaken by the convent in her regard.

2. It is to be given back to her as her absolute property.

¹ Vermeersch, *De Rel. Just. et Personis*, n. 181.

² *Ibid.* n. 182.

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE DECREE 'CUM DE SACRAMENTALIBUS'

We beg to call attention to an interpretation of the decree *Cum de Sacramentalibus* given by the Congregation of Religious, and published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* of June 1st.

The fifth article of the decree states: 'If any Religious for the peace of her soul or greater progress in spiritual perfection ask for a special confessor or spiritual director, the Ordinary has readily to grant her demand. The Ordinary, however, will see to it that abuses do not arise from such concession, and if abuses should come, let him cautiously and prudently remove them, always safeguarding liberty of conscience.'

Two doubts in connexion with this article were proposed for solution to the Congregation:

I. The first query was 'Whether the special confessor or spiritual director deputed for any Religious in accordance with Article V of the decree *Cum de Sacramentalibus* can remain perpetually in his office, or is rather to be granted for a fixed time.' The answer was that 'the special confessor or spiritual director should be granted, not for a fixed time, but for as long as there was a continuance of the just cause of spiritual necessity or utility on the part of the Religious who made the request, as regulated by the decree *Cum de Sacramentalibus*, under Article 13.'

This reply needs scarcely any comment. It is certainly not extensive. The decree commands that the appointment be made when a nun demands it for her spiritual necessity or utility, and the natural conclusion is that it should endure as long as the necessity or utility endures.

II. The second doubt was 'Whether one who has discharged for two years the office of ordinary confessor can be appointed special confessor or spiritual director of any Religious, even though a year has not yet elapsed from the expiration of his term of office.'

The answer was in the affirmative.

The trouble on this particular point arose from the fact that in Article 9 of the decree it is stated that a person in this position may not be appointed extraordinary confessor; and hence some were prone to conclude that the same thing was true in regard to the appointment of a special confessor. This conclusion was, in our opinion, by no means justified, as the parity between the two cases was altogether incomplete. Anyhow, the reply of the Congregation has set the question completely at rest.

J. KINANE.

LITURGY

CALENDAR TO BE FOLLOWED IN CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS

REV. DEAR SIR,—In a city where the Redemptorist Fathers have charge of a parish in which there are two chapels, open to the public, and they have Mass there every day, what Mass should they offer in these chapels—the Mass of their own *Ordo* or the Mass of the diocesan calendar? Of course they follow their own *Ordo* in their own parish church. By an ‘open chapel’ I mean one where lay people may attend Mass, as in the ‘Orphan Girls’ Home’ and in the chapel of the ‘Little Sisters of the Poor.’

A REDEMPTORIST MISSIONARY.

In such cases as those mentioned in the query the diocesan *Ordo* should be followed. As the point is of some importance, it may be desirable to quote authorities:—

(a) In the year 1896 the question was asked: ‘*Utrum (post Decretum Generale diei 9 Julii 1895: De Missa conformi Officio Ecclesiae vel Oratorii publici), Calendario loci, an vero Calendario celebrantis respondere debeant Missae, quae celebrantur in Capellis Episcoporum, Seminariorum, Collegiorum, piarum Communitatum, Hospitalium, et Carcerum?*’ The answer was: ‘*Dummodo agatur de Capella principali (quae instar Oratorii publici, ad effectum memorati Decreti, habenda est), Affirmative ad primam partem; Negative ad secundam.*’¹

(b) The case of Religious who say Mass in such Institutions is expressly touched upon in the following question and answer²: ‘*Ubi unus tantum Sacerdos, quoad Missae celebrationem, addictus sit Oratorii competenti auctoritate erectis in Gymnasiis, Hospitalibus ac Domibus quarumcumque piarum Communitatum, hic si Saecularis teneturne sequi Calendarium Dioecesis in qua extat Oratorium? et si Regularis Calendarium Ordinis, si proprio gaudeat, relinquere? R. Affirmative in omnibus, si Oratoria habenda sint ut publica; secus, Negative.*’ It is pretty clear from the first answer quoted that the principal Oratory of such Institutions is to be regarded as a public Oratory for the purpose of the decree of 1895.

(c) We will quote one more answer of the Congregation of Rites³:—

In eadem Civitate . . . est domus Sororum scholis addictarum, apud quas multae puellae bonis litteris instituendae degunt. In domo hac

¹ Decreta Auth. S. C. R., n. 3910.

² Ibid., 3919 ad XVII.

³ Decreta Auth. S. C. R., n. 4248, ad III, 11 Feb., 1910. The substance of the reply to another query, proposed in the same occasion, is thus given in the Index to Vol. vi. of the Authentic Decrees: ‘*Calendarium Regularium nequit adhiberi in Sacello Nosocomii licet Nosocomium extructum fuerit a Parocho Regulari, ejus administratio, juxta statuta suae foundationis, penes Parochum pro tempore Ecclesiae Regularis resideat, et unus ex Regularibus quotidie ibidem Missam celebret.*’

duo habentur Sacella, in quibus Sacrum peragitur, et quae a duobus Canonicis Regularibus supradictae Abbatiae S. Floriani inserviuntur, cum ipsis demandata fuerit ab Episcopo Linciensi cura spiritualis tam Sororum quam puellarum. Hisce expositis, quaeritur: An . . . in casu adhiberi valeat Directorium seu Calendarium proprium Canonice Regularium Lateranensium praefatae Congregationis?

The reply was: 'In Sacello principali publico vel semipublico, negative; in altero Sacello, utpote privato, affirmative.'

(d) Hence, with good reason, Van der Stappen writes¹: 'Itaque Sacerdos, sive Saecularis sive Regularis, celebrans, esto ex caritate, in Sacello piae Congregationis, tenetur dicere Missam loci Calendario conformem, si Capella uti publica, aut semipublica tenenda est.' And in the same connexion he uses words which are directly applicable to the case put by our correspondent: 'Etenim ex eo quod aliqua Religiosa Familia onus suscipit, aliquem e suo gremio mittendi ad aliquod Oratorium publicum, vel semipublicum, alicujus servitii causa, puta pro Missa celebranda, non inferri potest, dictum Oratorium ejusdem Familiae proprium vel quasi proprium evadere.' We do not think that the fact that the Institutions in question are *in* the parish administered by the Redemptorists makes any difference. The Institutions do not belong to the parish *as a parish*. They are not at all on the same footing as a chapel of ease, for instance. The priest who says Mass does so 'non tamquam Parochus, aut Rector, sed ex commissione Ordinarii.'

To prevent misunderstanding, it may be well to state that what we have written does not apply to the case of a community of nuns having a right to a proper *Ordo*.

LIGHT BEFORE THE BLESSED SACRAMENT IN A PRIVATE HOUSE

REV. DEAR SIR,—There is a certain parish in which the parish priest and curate live together. The parochial house is situated about ten yards from the church. In the parochial house there is an oratory in which there is no light, and has been no light for the last six months. The parish priest and curate keep their pyxes containing the Blessed Sacrament in this oratory. The curate knows that it is wrong to keep the Blessed Sacrament in a place without the proper light, but for the sake of domestic peace raises no objections, in the belief that he does not consider himself responsible for the violation of the rubric. What is to be done?

In this same parish the Blessed Sacrament is kept in a ciborium in the Tabernacle of the parochial church which stands, as said before, about ten yards from the parochial house. In this church there is a light kept burning. Is the curate *bound* to remove his pyx from the oratory in the parochial house to the Tabernacle in the church?

I shall be grateful for replies to these questions in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD.

HARASSED CURATE.

By the general law of the Church the Blessed Sacrament is to be

¹ Vol. ii. n. 387.

kept in the church with a light burning constantly before it *die noctuque*. And theologians commonly hold that it would be a grave sin to allow the lamp to remain extinguished during a whole day and night.

Only by a special privilege are priests allowed to keep the Blessed Sacrament in their houses; and we must see under what conditions the privilege is granted. According to the Formula VI, and the corresponding powers given at the present time, Irish Bishops have power to give their priests faculties 'Deferendi sanctissimum Sacramentum occulte ad infirmos sine lumine, illudque sine eodem retinendi pro eisdem infirmis, in loco tamen decenti, si ab haereticis aut infidelibus sit periculum sacrilegii.' One might argue from this that just as the Blessed Sacrament is carried to the sick without a light It may also be kept in a priest's house without a light. The former practice is universal in Ireland, although the danger of sacrilege from heretics is often non-existent.

The National Synod,¹ however, has defined the matter more strictly: 'SS. Sacramentum, quando in domo sacerdotali asservatur, sit tabernaculo inclusum; et lampas coram ipso semper colluceat, nisi forte in casu, qui rarus erit, in quo minus tuta hujus ritus observantia, idque judicio Episcopo, censeatur.' The words used are practically those of the Roman Ritual. There can be no doubt, we think, that this regulation is binding in conscience; reverence towards the Blessed Sacrament demands the use of a light in a private oratory as well as in the church. O'Kane, however, seems to take a more lenient view of the obligation in the former case.

It would seem [he says²], from the first Synod of Westminster, that in England permission is not given to keep the Blessed Sacrament anywhere without a light. It would be impossible to observe the same strictness in Ireland, where the priest is, in some cases, so badly lodged. At the same time, no one doubts that every priest who has permission to keep the Blessed Sacrament in his house, should aim at providing, as far as circumstances permit, and on a scale commensurate with the place in which he keeps It, everything that the rubric prescribes for Its custody in parish churches.

At any rate, to come to our correspondent's special difficulties, the parish priest is the person responsible for the maintenance of the light. Nor do we think that the curate is bound, in the circumstances, to remove his pyx to the church.

TABERNACLE VEIL

REV. DEAR SIR, Will you kindly explain the rubrics regarding the necessity for using the tabernacle veil. Is the veil needed when there is an inner or second door on the Tabernacle?

ENQUIRER.

We discussed this matter at some length in a rather recent issue of the I. E. RECORD.³ Not only the Roman Ritual but several answers of

¹ *Acta et Decreta*, p. 64, d. 77, 3°.

² N. 617.

³ See I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, vol. viii. (Dec. 1916), pp. 510-11.

the Congregation of Rites insist that the Tabernacle should be covered, with a canopy or veil. This is true, even when the Tabernacle is constructed of some precious metal, such as gold or silver. The fact that the Tabernacle has a second door does not excuse from the obligation of providing a canopy. The canopy or veil is not used merely to keep out dust; it has a symbolical meaning also. And it is principally for the latter reason that the Congregation of Rites has so unvaryingly insisted on its use.

HISTORICAL LESSONS OF THE FEAST OF ST. EUNAN

REV. DEAR SIR,—In the new Irish Supplement the historical Lessons of St. Eunan (September 23) are omitted. Kindly say if this should be so.

A PRIEST.

We do not know that there is any authority for the suppression of the historical Lessons. As already pointed out in the I. E. RECORD¹ we believe this is an oversight on the part of the compiler of the Supplement.

EXSEQUIAL MASS 'PRO PAUPERE DEFUNCTO'—THE IRISH PRIVILEGE OF CELEBRATING A LOW EXSEQUIAL MASS 'OB INOPIAM SACERDOTUM'

REV. DEAR SIR,—In our *Ordo* (page xii) regarding Masses for the Dead (n. 3) it is laid down that a Low Mass can be said for a deceased poor person whose body is present, on the same days and under the same conditions in which a Mass *cum cantu* is permitted. Then, in section (4) a more restricted concession *ob inopiam sacerdotum* is granted to Ireland (S. C. R. 9 Maii, 1899). Now, does the wider and later concession apply to Ireland also for the case of a deceased poor person? And does the concession in the fourth section apply *now* only to a case of 'corpore praesente sed non paupere' when 'ob inopiam sacerdotum' a Mass *cum cantu* cannot be celebrated?

M. F.

The privilege in favour of a deceased person whose family is unable to bear the expenses of a sung Mass applies to Ireland as well as other countries. If the family is able to bear the expenses a Low Mass cannot be celebrated except on days which permit the ordinary *Missa quotidiana*. That is, according to the general rule. The special Irish privilege provides that (even when the family could well bear the expenses of a sung Mass) a Low Mass may be celebrated (except on the days mentioned in the Rescript), when it is impossible to procure the services of priests for a sung Mass. Practically, then, the Irish privilege is restricted at the present day to the cases of persons whose families are not poor, in the sense of the decrees. At the present time an occasion rarely arises for availing of the special Irish privilege. Generally speaking, the services of the requisite number of priests can be secured.

T. O'DOHERTY.

¹ See I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, vol. viii. (Dec. 1916), p. 516; also the issues for Oct. 1916, p. 349, and Nov. 1916, pp. 425-6.

DOCUMENTS

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF THE HOLY FATHER ON THE PREACHING OF THE WORD OF GOD

(June 15, 1917)

ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV

LITTERAE ENCYCLICAE

DE PRAEDICATIONE DIVINI VERBI

AD PATRIARCHAS, PRIMATES, ARCHIEPISCOPOS, EPISCOPOS ALIOSQUE
LOCORUM ORDINARIOS, PACEM ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA
SEDE HABENTES.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV

VENERABILES FRATRES SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM

Humani generis Redemptionem Iesus Christus in ara Crucis moriendo cum consummasset, velletque adducere homines ut, suis praeceptis obtemperando, compotes fierent aeternae vitae, non alia usus est via quam suorum voce praeconum qui, quae ad salutem credenda faciendaeque essent, hominum universitati denuntiarent. *Placuit Deo per stultitiam praedicationis salvos facere credentes.*¹ Elegit igitur Apostolos, quibus cum per Spiritum Sanctum dona infudisset tanto muneri consentanea, *Euntes*, inquit, *in mundum universum praedicate Evangelium.*² Quae quidem praedicatio faciem orbis terrae renovavit. Nam, si Fides christiana mentes hominum a multiplici errore ad veritatem, animosque a sordibus vitiorum ad omnium virtutum excellentiam convertit, profecto ipsius praedicationis ope convertit: *Fides ex auditu, auditus autem per verbum Christi.*³ Quapropter, quoniam, Dei nutu, iisdem causis quibus procreatae sunt, res conservantur, patet praedicationem christianae sapientiae ad continuandum aeternae salutis opus divinitus adhiberi; et eam in maximis gravissimisque rebus iure numerari: in quam propterea curae cogitationesque a Nobis praecipuae conferendae sunt, maxime si aliqua ex parte, a nativa integritate, cum suae efficacitatis detrimento, deficere videatur.

Id enimvero est, venerabiles Fratres, quod ad ceteras misérias horum temporum quibus Nos ante alios sollicitamur, accedit. Etenim, si circumspiciamus quam multi sint qui verbo Dei praedicando dant operam, tanta occurrit copia, quanta fortasse numquam fuit antea. Si autem consideremus, quo loco sint publice ac privatim mores atque instituta

¹ 1 Cor. i. 21.

² Marc. xvi. 15.

³ Rom. x. 17.

populorum, crescit in dies vulgo rerum quae supra naturam sunt, despicientia et oblivio; sensim a christianae virtutis severitate disceditur, maioresque ad probrosam ethnicorum vitam quotidie regressus fiunt.

Horum quidem malorum variae sunt multiplicesque causae: nemo tamen negaverit deplorandum esse quod eis malis a ministris verbi non satis afferatur medicinae. Numquid sermo Dei talis esse desiit, qualis ab Apostolo dicebatur, vivus et efficax et penetrabilior omni gladio ancipiti? Num gladii huius aciem usus diuturnitas hebetavit? Vitio certe tribuendum est ministrorum qui non tractant, quemadmodum oportet, hunc gladium, si is non omnibus locis vim suam exerceat. Neque enim dici potest melioribus, quam nos, temporibus Apostolos usos esse, quasi tum aut plus esset docilitatis ad Evangelium aut minus contra divinam legem contumaciae.

Omnino igitur, quod Nos apostolici officii conscientia admonet duorumque proximorum Decessorum exemplum hortatur, huc summo studio, pro rei gravitate, incumbendum Nobis esse intelligimus, ut praedicationem divini verbi ad eam normam, ad quam Christi Domini iussu Ecclesiaeque statutis dirigenda est, ubique revocemus.

Principio, venerabiles Fratres, quaeramus oportet, quas ob causas in hoc genere de via declinetur. Iam istae causae ad tres redire videntur: aut is ad praedicandum assumitur qui non debet; aut id muneris non eo exercetur consilio quo debet; aut non eo modo quo oportet.

Etenim praedicationis munus, ex Tridentinae Synodi doctrina *Episcoporum praecipuum est*.¹ Apostoli quidem, quorum in locum successere Episcopi, hoc maxime suarum partium esse duxerunt. Ita Paulus: *Non enim misit me Christus baptizare, sed evangelizare*.² Ceterorum autem Apostolorum ea fuit sententia: *Non est aequum nos derelinquere verbum Dei, et ministrare mensis*.³ Etsi autem proprium id est Episcoporum, tamen, quoniam variis distenti curis in suarum gubernatione ecclesiarum, nec semper nec usque quaque ipsi per se possunt, necesse est etiam per alios huic officio satisfaciant. Quare in hoc munere quicumque praeter Episcopos versantur, dubitandum non est quin, episcopali fungentes officio, versentur.—Haec igitur prima lex sanciat, ut munus praedicationis sua sponte suscipere liceat nemini; sed ad illud exsequendum cuivis opus sit missione legitima, quae, nisi ab Episcopo, dari non potest: *Quomodo praedicabunt, nisi mittantur?*⁴ Missi sunt enim Apostoli et ab Eo missi qui summus est Pastor et Episcopus animarum nostrarum⁵; missi septuaginta duo illi discipuli; ipseque Paulus, quamvis constitutus iam a Christo vas electionis ut nomen eius coram gentibus et regibus portaret,⁶ tum demum iniit apostolatam quum seniores, Spiritus Sancti mandato *Segregate mihi Saulum in opus* (Evangelii),⁷ obtemperantes, eum cum impositione manuum dimisissent. Id quod primis Ecclesiae temporibus perpetuo usitatum est. Omnes enim, vel qui in sacerdotum ordine eminebant, ut Origenes, et qui postea ad

¹ Sess. xxiv. *De Ref.*, c. iv.

² 1 Cor. i. 17.

³ Act. vi. 2.

⁴ Rom. x. 15.

⁵ 1 Petr. ii. 25.

⁶ Act. ix. 15.

⁷ Ibid. xiii. 2.

episcopatum evecti sunt, ut Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus, ut Ioannes Chrysostomus, ut Augustinus ceterique Doctores Ecclesiae veteres, sese ex sui quisque Episcopi auctoritate ad praedicandum contulerant.

Nunc vero, venerabiles Fratres, longe aliud venisse in consuetudinem videtur. E sacris oratoribus non ita pauci sunt in quos apte cadere illud dixeris quod queritur Dominus apud Ieremiam: *Non mittebam prophetas, et ipsi currebant*.¹ Nam cuicumque vel ex ingenii indole vel aliis quibusvis de causis *ministerium verbi* suscipere libuerit, facile ei patet aditus ad suggesta templorum tamquam ad palaestram in qua quivis suo arbitratu sese exerceat. Itaque ut iam de medio tollatur tanta perversitas, vestrum est, venerabiles Fratres, providere; et quoniam de pabulo vestris gregibus praebito reddenda Deo Ecclesiaeque a vobis ratio est, ne sinite ut quis, iniussu vestro, in ovile se inferat, et oves Christi ad suum arbitrium pascatur. Nemo igitur in dioecesibus vestris, nisi vocatus probatusque a vobis, iam nunc sacras conciones habeat.

Hic vero summa cum vigilantia attendatis volumus quibus munus tam sanctum demandetis. Qua in re Episcopis hoc tantum, Concilii Tridentini decreto, permittitur ut *idoneos* eligant, id est qui possint *officium praedicationis salubriter exsequi*. *Salubriter*, dictum est—notate verbum quo rei continetur norma—non *eloquenter*, non *cum plausu audientium*, verum cum animarum fructu, ad quem, tamquam finem, divini verbi administratio pertinet.—Quod si pressius definiri a Nobis cupitis quos reapse habeatis idoneos, eos dicimus in quibus divinae vocationis argumenta reperietis. Nam quod requiritur ut quis ad sacerdotium admittatur: *Nec quisquam sumit sibi honorem, sed qui vocatur a Deo*,² idem opus est ut quis ad praedicandum habilis aptusque iudicetur. Quae quidem vocatio haud difficile deprehenditur. Christus enim, Dominus et Magister Noster, cum in eo esset ut in caelum adscenderet, nequaquam dixit Apostolis ut illico, diversi abeuntes, praedicare inciperent: *Sedete*, inquit, *in civitate, quoadusque induamini virtute ex alto*.³ Hoc igitur erit indicio quempiam divinitus ad id muneris vocari, si is virtute ex alto sit indutus. Quod cuiusmodi sit, licet ex iis colligere, venerabiles Fratres, quae in Apostolis, statim ut virtutem desuper acceperint, scimus evenisse. Ubi enim in eos Spiritus Sanctus descendit—ne mirifica, quibus aucti sunt, charismata attingamus—ex rudibus infirmisque hominibus docti perfectique evaserunt. Sit igitur sacerdos quispiam congruenti tum scientia tum virtute praeditus—modo ei dona naturae suppetant quae necessaria sunt ne tentetur Deus—recte ad praedicationem vocatus videbitur, neque erit cur ab Episcopo ad hoc munus non possit assumi. Quod ipsum vult Tridentina Synodus, cum edicit, ne quos Episcopus praedicare sinat qui non *sint moribus et doctrina probati*.⁴ Itaque Episcopi est eos, quibus praedicandi munus deferre cogitat, diu multumque experiri ut quae quantaque sit eorum et doctrinae copia et vitae sanctimonia cognoscat. Qui si remisse negligenterque se gesserit, is profecto in re gravissima deliquerit, et in eius caput culpa recidet vel errorum quos imperitus praedicator fuderit, vel offensionis malique exempli quod improbus dederit.

¹ Ierem. xxiii. 21.² Hebr. v. 4.³ Luc. xxiv. 49.⁴ Loc. cit.

Quo autem faciliores in hoc vestras, venerabiles Fratres, reddamus partes, volumus ut qui praedicandi potestatem petunt, non secus ac qui confessiones peccatorum excipiendi, de eorum moribus et eruditione posthac duplex severumque fiat iudicium. Quisquis igitur in alterutro mancus et claudicans repertus sit, nullo rei cuiusquam respectu, repellatur ab eiusmodi munere cui non esse eum idoneum constiterit. Postulat id vestra ipsorum dignitas, quorum vices a praedicatoribus geruntur, ut diximus; flagitat Ecclesiae sanctae utilitas, quandoquidem *sal terrae et lux mundi* esse,¹ si quis alius, is debet qui in verbi ministerio versatur.

His probe consideratis rebus, ultra progredi ad explicandum quem sacrae praedicationis et finem et modum esse oporteat, supervacaneum potest videri. Nam si ad eam, quam memoravimus, regulam sacrorum oratorum delectus exigatur, quid est dubii quin, congruis ornati virtutibus, dignam in praedicando et causam sibi proponant et rationem teneant? Sed tamen prodest haec duo illustrare capita, ut eo melius appareat, quare interdum boni praedicatoris forma in nonnullis desideretur.

Quid praedicatoribus debeat in suscepto munere exsequendo esse propositum, licet intelligere ex eo quod ii possunt ac debent de se idem, quod Paulus, affirmare: *Pro Christo legatione fungimur.*² Si autem legati sunt Christi, illud ipsum velle debent in legatione peragenda quod Christus voluit in danda; immo quod ipse, dum vixit in terris, sibi proposuit. Neque enim Apostoli, et praedicatores post Apostolos, alio missi sunt atque Christus: *Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos.*³ Scimus autem cuius rei gratia Christus de caelo descenderit: aperte enim declaravit: *Ego ad hoc veni in mundum, ut testimonium perhibeam veritati,*⁴ *Ego veni, ut vitam habeant.*⁵

Utrumque igitur persequantur oportet qui sacrae praedicationi dant operam, id est, ut traditae a Deo veritatis diffundant lumen et ut in iis qui audiunt, supernaturalem excitent alantque vitam; brevi, ut animarum quaerendo salutem, Dei promoveant gloriam. Quare, sicut perperam appelletur medicus, qui medicinam non faciat, vel alicuius artis doctor qui eam non doceat artem, sic qui praedicando non curat ad pleniorum Dei cognitionem et ad aeternae salutis viam homines adducere, eum declamatorem vaniloquum appellari licet, praedicatorum evangelicum non licet. Atque utinam huiusmodi declamatores nulli sint!—Quid vero est quo ducuntur maxime? Alii quidem inanis gloriae cupiditate: cui scilicet ut satisfaciant: ‘Student magis alta quam apta dicere, facientes apud infirmas intelligentias miraculum sui, non ipsorum salutem operantes. Erubescunt humilia et plana dicere, ne sola haec scisse videantur. . . . Erubescunt lactare parvulos.’⁶ Cumque Iesus Dominus ex humilitate auditorum ostenderet se eum esse qui expectabatur: *Pauperes evangelizantur,*⁷ quid non moliuntur isti, ut ex urbium celebritate atque ex primariorum dignitate templorum commendationem suis sermonibus

¹ Matth. v. 13, 14.

² 2 Cor. v. 20.

³ Ioan. xx. 21.

⁴ Ibid. xviii. 37.

⁵ Ibid. x. 10.

⁶ Gillebertus Ab., *In Cant. Canticor.* serm. xxvii. 2.

⁷ Matth. xi. 5.

acquirant? Quoniam autem in rebus a Deo revelatis quaedam sunt quibus corruptae humanae naturae perterreatur infirmitas, quaeque ob eam causam accommodatae non sunt ad evocandam multitudinem ab iis caute se abinent eaque tractant in quibus, si loci rationem excipias, nihil est sacrum. Ac non raro contingit ut in media pertractatione rerum aeternarum labantur ad politica, praesertim si quid eius generis animos audientium vehementer teneat occupatos. Omnino unum hoc iis esse studium videtur, placere audientibus eisque morem gerere quos Paulus *prurientes auribus*¹ dicit. Hinc ille gestus non sedatus et gravis, sed qualis in scaena aut in concione populari solet agi; hinc illae vocis vel remissiones molliores, vel contentiones tragicae; hinc illud orationis genus proprium ephemeridum; hinc sententiarum illa copia ab impiorum et acatholicorum petita scriptis, non a divinis Litteris, non a Sanctis Patribus; hinc denique illa et, quae ab eorum plerisque usurpatur volubilitas tanta verborum, qua obtundant quidem aures et admirationem moveant audientibus, sed nihil his boni afferant quod domum reportent. Iam vero mirum quantum praedicatores isti opinione falluntur. Habeant licet quem tanto cum labore nec sine sacrilegio petunt plausum imperitorum: num pretium est operae, quando simul subeunda eis est prudentium omnium vituperatio et, quod est maius, formidandum Christi severissimum iudicium?

Quamquam, venerabiles Fratres, unice plausus quaerere praedicando non omnium est qui a regula maerant. Plerumque huiusmodi significationes qui captant, ideo captant ut eas ad aliud assequendum dirigant vel minus honestum. Nam, oblivioni dantes illud Gregorii: 'Non praedicat sacerdos ut comedat, sed ideo ut praedicet, manducare debet'² haud ita rari sunt qui, cum ad alia munera, quibus decenter alerentur, non se factos esse intelligerent, ad praedicationem se contulerunt, non ministerii sanctissimi rite exercendi, verum quaestus faciendi causa. Videmus igitur curas omnes istorum minime conversas esse ad quaerendum ubi maior sperari possit fructus animarum, sed ubi plus conficiatur praedicando lucri.

Iam vero, cum ab his nihil expectare liceat Ecclesiae, nisi damnum et dedecus, summopere vobis, venerabiles Fratres, est vigilandum, ut, si quem inveneritis praedicatione ad suam gloriam vel ad quaestum abuti, eum sine cunctatione amoveatis ab officio praedicandi. Nam qui rem tam sanctam polluere non veretur tanta perversitate propositi, non sane dubitabit ad omnes indignitates descendere, ignominiae labem aspergens non sibi tantum, sed ipsi etiam sacro muneri, quod tam prave administrat.

Eadem autem erit adhibenda severitas in eos qui quo decet modo non praedicent, propterea quod ea neglexerint, quae ad recte hoc ministerium obeundum necessario requiruntur. Haec vero quae sint, docet exemplo suo is qui ab Ecclesia cognominatus est *Praedicator veritatis*, Paulus Apostolus: cuius similes praedicatores utinam, Dei miserentis beneficio, multo plures habeamus.

Primum igitur quod discimus a Paulo hoc est, quam bene paratus

¹ 2 Tim. iv. 3.

² In I Regum, lib. III.

et instructus ad praedicandum venerit. Neque vero hic loquimur de doctrinae studiis in quibus, Gamaliele magistro, diligenter versatus erat. Scientia enim in eo *per revelationem* infusa, obscurabat ac paene obruebat eam quam ipse sibi comparaverat : quamquam hanc quoque non parum ei profuisse ex eius Epistolis apparet. Prorsus necessaria est praedicatori scientia, ut diximus, cuius quidem luce qui caret, facile labitur, ex Concilii Lateranensis IV verissima sententia : 'Ignorantia est mater cunctorum errorum.' Non tamen de qualibet rerum scientia volumus intelligi, sed de ea scilicet quae propria est sacerdotis, quaeque, ut in pauca conferamus rem, cognitione sui, Dei, et officiorum continetur : sui, inquit, ut suas quisque utilitates omittat ; Dei, ut omnes ad eum et cognoscendum et diligendum adducat ; officiorum, ut ea servet et servari praecipiat. Ceterarum rerum scientia, ista si desit, *inflat* nec quicquam prodest.

Illud potius videamus, qualis in Apostolo praeparatio fuerit animi. Qua quidem in re tria sunt maxime consideranda. Primum ut se totum Paulus divinae voluntati dederit. Vixdum enim, cum iter faceret Damascus, Iesu Domini virtute tactus est, edidit illam Apostolo dignam vocem : *Domine, quid me vis facere ?*¹ Nam promiscua illi statim coeperunt esse pro Christo, sicut perpetuo fuerunt postea, laborare et quiescere, egere et abundare, laudari et contemni, vivere et mori. Non est dubium quin ideo in apostolatu tantum profecerit, quod se Dei voluntati pleno cum obsequio permisit. Quare similiter ante omnia obsequatur Deo quisquis praedicator ad salutem animarum nititur ; ut nihil quidquam sit sollicitus quos auditores, quem successum, quos fructus habiturus sit : denique ut Deum dumtaxat, non se respiciat.

Hoc autem tantum Deo obsequendi studium animum postulat adeo comparatum ad patiendum, ut nullum fugiat laboris molestiaeque genus. Quod alterum in Paulo fuit insigne. Nam, cum de eo dixisset Dominus ; *Ego ostendam illi, quanta oporteat eum pro nomine meo pati,*² ipse deinde aerumnas omnes tanta cum voluntate complexus est ut scriberet : *Superabundo gaudio in omni tribulatione nostra.*³ Iam vero haec laboris tolerantia in praedicatore si emineat, cum quicquid humani in eo sit, abstergeat, ac Dei gratiam ei ad fructum ferendum conciliet, tum incredibile est quam eius operam christiano populo commendet. Contra, parum ad permovendos animos ii possunt, qui quocumque venerint, ibi commoditates vitae plus aequo consecantur, ac dum suas conciones habeant, nihil aliud fere attingunt ministerii sacri, ut appareat plus eos propriae servire valetudini, quam animarum utilitati.

Tertio denique loco *spiritum orationis* qui dicitur, necessarium praedicatori esse intelligimus ex Apostolo ; qui ut primum vocatus est ad apostolatum, Deo supplex esse instituit : *Ecce enim orat.*⁴ Etenim non copiose dicendo nec subtiliter disserendo aut vehementer perorando salus quaeritur animarum : qui hic consistat praedicator nihil est nisi *aes sonans aut cymbalum tinniens.*⁵ Id quo fit ut vigeant humana verba mirificeque valeant ad salutem, divina est gratia : *Deus incrementum*

¹ Act. ix. 6.² 2 Cor. vii. 4.⁵ 1 Cor. xiii. 1.² Ibid. ix. 16.⁴ Act. ix. 11.

*dedit.*¹ Dei autem gratia non studio et arte comparatur, sed precibus impetratur. Quare qui parum aut nihil orationi est deditus, frustra in praedicatione operam curamque consumit, cum coram Deo nec sibi nec audientibus quicquam proficiat.

Itaque, paucis concludentes quae hactenus diximus, his Petri Damiani verbis utamur: 'Praedicatori duo sunt permaxime necessaria, videlicet ut sententiis doctrinae spiritualis exuberet, et religiosae vitae splendore coruscet. Quod si sacerdos quispiam ad utrumque non sufficit, ut et vita clarus et doctrinae facultate sit profluus; melior est vita procul dubio quam doctrina. . . . Plus valet vitae claritas ad exemplum, quam eloquentia vel urbanitas accurata sermonum. . . . Necesse est ut sacerdos, qui praedicationis officio fungitur, et doctrinae spiritualis imbribus pluat, et religiosae vitae radiis spendeat: instar illius Angeli, qui natum Dominum pastoribus nuntians, et splendore claritatis emicuit, et quod evangelizare venerat, verbis expressit.'²

Sed, ut ad Paulum redeamus, si quaerimus quibus de rebus consuevisset praedicando agere, ipse sic omnia complectitur: *Non enim iudicavi me scire aliquid inter vos, nisi Iesum Christum, et hunc crucifixum.*³ Efficere ut Iesum Christum homines magis magisque cognoscerent et quidem cognitione quae ad vivendum, non modo ad credendum, pertineret, hoc est quod omni apostolici pectoris contentione laboravit. Itaque Christi dogmata et praecepta omnia vel severiora sic tradebat ut nihil nec reticeret nec molliret, de humilitate, de abnegatione sui, de castitate, de rerum humanarum contemptu, de obedientia, de venia inimicis danda, de similibus. Nec vero timide illa denuntiabat: inter Deum et Belial eligendum esse cui serviatur, utrique non posse; omnes, ut e vivis excesserint, tremendum manere indicium; cum Deo non licere transigi; aut vitam aeternam sperandam, si universae obtemperetur legi, aut, si cupiditatibus indulgendo deseratur officium, ignem aeternum esse expectandum. Neque enim *Praedicator veritatis* unquam putavit abstinendum ab huiusmodi argumentis propterea quia, ob corruptionem temporum, nimis dura viderentur iis, ad quos loquebatur.—Apparet igitur quam non probandi sint ii praedicatores, qui quaedam christianae doctrinae capita, ne fastidio sint audientibus, non audent attingere. Num medicus quisquam inutilia remedia dabit aegrotanti, quia is ab utilibus abhorreat? Ceterum inde probabitur oratoris virtus et facultas, si, quae ingrata sunt, ea grata dicendo reddiderit.

Quae autem tractanda suscepit, quo modo Apostolos explicabat? *Non in persuasibilibus humanae sapientiae verbis.*⁴ Quanti refert, venerabiles Fratres, hoc omnibus esse exploratissimum, cum videmus non paucos e sacris concinatoribus ita dicere ut Scripturas Sanctas, Patres Doctoresque Ecclesiae, theologiae sacrae argumenta praetermittant; nihil fere nisi rationem loquantur. Perperam profecto: neque enim in ordine supernaturali humanis tantum adminiculis quidquam proficitur.—At illud opponitur: praedicatori qui quae divinitus revelata sunt, urgeat, non haberi fidem.—Itane vero? Sit sane apud acatholicos:

¹ 1 Cor. iii. 6.

² Epp. lib. I, Ep. I ad Cinthium Urbis Praef.

³ 1 Cor. ii. 2.

⁴ Ibid. ii. 4.

quamquam cum Graeci sapientiam, nimirum huius saeculi, quaerent, Apostolus tamen eis Christum crucifixum praedicabat.¹ Quod si oculos convertamus ad gentes catholicas, in his ii qui alieni sunt a nobis, fere Fidei radicem retinent: mentem enim obcaecantur eo quod animi cor-rumpuntur.

Postremo qua mente praedicabat Paulus? Non ut hominibus, sed ut Christo placeret: *Si hominibus placerem, Christi servus non essem.*² Cum animum gereret incensum caritate Christi, nihil quaerebat praeter Christi gloriam. O utinam qui in verbi ministerio elaborant, omnes vere Iesum Christum diligant; utinam possint illa usurpare Pauli: *Propter quem (Iesum Christum) omnia detrimentum feci*³; et *Mihi vivere Christus est.*⁴ Tantum qui amore ardent, ceteros inflammare sciunt. Quare S. Bernardus ita praedicatorem admonet: 'Si sapis, concham te exhibebis et non canalem'⁵; hoc est: quod dicis, eo plenus ipse esto, et ne satis habeas in alios transfundere. 'Verum, ut idem Doctor addit, canales hodie in Ecclesia multos habemus, conchas vero perpaucas!'⁶

Hoc ne eveniat in posterum, vobis omni ope atque opera enitendum est, venerabiles Fratres: quorum est et indignos repellendo, et idoneos eligendo, conformando, moderando, efficere ut praedicatores, qui sint secundum Dei cor, iam plurimi exsistant.—Respiciat autem misericors gregem suum Pastor aeternus, Iesus Christus, Virgine Sanctissima quidem, ut Matre augusta ipsius Verbi incarnati et Regina Apostolorum, deprecante; ac spiritum apostolatus in Clero refovens, plurimos esse iubeat qui studeant 'seipsos probabiles exhibere Deo, operarios inconfusibiles, recte tractantes verbum veritatis.'⁷

Auspiciem divinorum munerum ac testem benevolentiae Nostrae vobis, venerabiles Fratres, vestroque Clero ac populo apostolicam benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die xv iunii, in festo Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu, anno MCMXVII, Pontificatus Nostri tertio.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

RULES FOR PREACHING IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ENCYCLICAL, PRESCRIBED BY THE SACRED CONSISTORIAL CONGREGATION

(June 28, 1917)

ACTA SS. CONGREGATIONUM SACRA CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS NORMAE PRO SACRA PRAEDICATIONE

Ut quae Beatissimus Pater nuper in Encyclicis Litteris *Humani generis redemptionem* de sacra praedicatione docuit ac praestituit ad praxim facilius deducantur, Eminentissimi Patres S. C. Consistoriali

¹ 1 Cor. i. 22, 23.

² Gal. i. 10.

³ Philip. iii. 8.

⁴ Ibid. i. 21.

⁵ In Cant. serm 18.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ 2 Tim. ii. 15.

praepositi, ipso Summo Pontifice plene adprobante, sequentes sancivere normas, quibus Rñi locorum Ordinarii uti debeant ut tuto in re tam gravi procedant; easque eadem Sanctitas Sua statim executioni mandandas praecipit, quo scilicet quod Apostolus nominat *ministerium verbi* eos afferat fructus in tuitionem ac propagationem fidei christianaeque vitae custodiam, quales et divinus Magister Christus intendit et catholica Ecclesia sibi iure promittit.

CAPUT I

A quibus et qua ratione praedicatores Verbi Dei sint eligendi

1. Rñi locorum Ordinarii illud ante omnia semper prae oculis habeant, quod Sacra Tridentina Synodus, anteriores praescriptiones innovans ac perstringens, cap. IV, sess. 24, *De Reform.*, sancit; ubi, postquam monuit *praedicationis munus Episcoporum praecipuum* esse, sic sequitur: *Mandat (S. Synodus) ut in Ecclesia sua ipsi (Episcopi) per se, aut, si legitime impediti fuerint, per eos quos ad praedicationis officium assumunt; in aliis autem Ecclesiis per parochos, sive, iis impeditis, per alios ab Episcopis (impensis eorum qui eas praestare aut tenentur vel solent) deputandos, in civitate aut in quacumque parte dioecesis censebunt expedire, saltem dominicis et solemnioribus diebus festis . . . sacras Scripturas divini namque legem annuntient. Nullus autem saecularis sive regularis, etiam in Ecclesiis suorum Ordinum, contradicente Episcopo, praedicare praesumat.*

Quod plane in novo ecclesiastico Codice confirmatur can. 1327, 1328 et 1337.

2. Cum igitur ad Episcopum loci Ordinarium praedicandi munus praecipue spectet, cumque ad eundem pertineat *assumere* ac *deputare* qui ipsum substituant proque ipso suppleant in hoc gravissimo ministerio, etiam specificè in casu qua praedicationis impensae, aut ex iure aut ex consuetudine, ab aliis sint persolvendae; nullus nec valide nec licite eligere aut advocare concionatorem quempiam etiam pro ecclesia propria; nullusque de clero sive saeculari sive regulari, huiusmodi inventionem licite acceptare poterit, nisi intra limites ac modos in sequentibus articulis statutos.

3. Parochi, vi missionis habitae in eorum electione, sicut ad confessiones excipiendas habilitantur, ita etiam facultate concionandi gaudent, salva quidem lege residentiae salvisque conditionibus ceteris, quas Ordinarius necessario vel utiliter apponendas censuerit. Idem de Canonico Theologo dicendum quoad lectiones Scripturae sacrae.

4. In reliquis casibus universis, ad praedicandum populo fidelium in publicis templis vel oratoriis, etiam regularium, et a sacerdotibus etiam regularibus, necesse est ut facultas obtineatur ab Ordinario dioecesis.

5. Huiusmodi facultas, ad normam eorum quae in Codice praescribuntur can. 1341, §§ 1 et 2, petenda est:

(a) a prima Capituli dignitate, audito tamen Capitulo, pro praedicationibus, quae ex lege vel voluntate Capituli fiant in ecclesia propria;

(b) a Superiore regulari, servatis respectivi Ordinis vel Congregationis regulis, pro ecclesiis religionum clericalium;

(c) a parochio pro ecclesia parochiali aliisque ecclesiis ab ea dependentibus;

(d) et si agatur de parochio ecclesiae spectantis ad Capitulum vel ad Ordinem religiosum, ab eodem parochio pro concionibus quae ab ipso pendent, secluso Capituli vel religionis interventu;

(e) a sacerdote primicerio vel capellano confraternitatis cuiuslibet pro ecclesia propria;

(f) a sacerdote ecclesiae rectore, quique sacras ibidem functiones de iure peragit, pro omnibus ecclesiis aliarum corporationum moralium non clericalium, aut religionum laicalium, monialium, privatorum.

6. Ad tramitem decisionum S. C. Concilii in *Sutrina*, 8 maii 1688, et in *Ripana*, 21 maii 1707, qui praedictam facultatem postulat, debet tantum concionatoris nomen proponere, idque subordinate ad beneplacitum Ordinarii, qui solus uti potest verbis *eligimus et deputamus ad postulationem* N. N., etc.

7. Postulatio ad obtinendum concionatorem aliquem facienda est tempore utili et opportuno, ut Ordinarius commode queat informationes necessarias de eiusdem persona habere (Codic., can. 1341, § 2): hoc autem tempus, generatim loquendo, haud erit inferius duobus mensibus, uti iam statuit S. C. Concilii in *Theanen.*, 19 aprilis 1728 et 30 aprilis 1729; salva tamen Episcopis facultate tempus aliud statuendi etiam brevius pro genere et gravitate praedicationis et pro qualitate concionatoris, dioecesani vel extradioecesani.

8. Quicumque, obligatione petendi facultatem posthabita, sacerdotem quempiam ad concionandum invitaverit; itemque sacerdos quilibet, qui tali modo invitatus scienter acceptarit et concionatus fuerit, puniendi sunt ab Ordinario poenis eius arbitrio statuendis, non exclusa suspensione a divinis.

9. Facultas praedicandi, quando agitur de concionatore extradioecesano, scripto tribuenda erit, designatō etiam loco et genere praedicationis, pro quibus concessa fuerit.

10. Ordinarii, *onerata graviter eorum conscientia*, facultatem concionandi nemini concedent, nisi prius ipsis constiterit de illius pietate, scientia et idoneitate, secundum praescriptiones quae sequenti capite traduntur: si vero agitur de sacerdotibus extradioecesanis vel de religiosis cuiuscumque Ordinis, nisi prius respectivum Ordinarium et Superiorem interpellaverint ac responsionem favorabilem habuerint.

11. Ordinarius et Superior regularis, qui ab alio Ordinario de informationibus interrogati fuerint circa pietatem, scientiam atque idoneitatem ad praedicandum cuiuspiam eorum subditi, tenentur *sub gravi* eas pro veritate tradere, secundum scientiam et conscientiam prout in can. 1341, § 1, novi Codicis praescribitur. Ordinarius vero qui illas recipit, tenetur eisdem se conformare, secretum de acceptis notiitiis absolute servando.

12. Ordinarius qui, ob informationes ut supra acceptas aut aliam ob causam, censuerit in Domino concionandi facultatem alicui denegare, sufficit ut idipsum petenti facultatem significet quin aliud addat, *soli Deo rationem de sua sententia redditurus*.

CAPUT II

Quo pacto constare debeat de idoneitate concionatoria

13. Generatim loquendo, sicut adtribuendam sacerdoti cuius facultatem pro ministerio excipiendi fidelium confessiones Ordinarii arctissime obligantur certitudinem acquirere de eius idoneitate et culpa se innexos reputarent si ad tantum munus admitterent qui moribus foret indignus, vel scientiae debitae defectu incapax; ita et non aliter iidem Ordinarii debent se gerere, antequam aliquem assumant et destinent ad ministerium verbi.

14. Medium ordinarium ad dignoscendam cuiuspiam idoneitatem ad praedicationis officium, praesertim quoad scientiam et quoad actionem, est examen a candidato voce et scripto subeundem coram tribus examinatorebus, qui arbitrio Ordinarii possunt seligi vel inter examinadores synodales vel etiam inter sacerdotes extradiocesanos, aut etiam e clero regulari.

Cognita autem idoneitate quoad scientiam et actionem, vel etiam in antecessum, haud minori studio, imo etiam maiori, inquireret Ordinarius num idem candidatus pietate, honestate morum et publica aestimatione dignus sit qui verbum Dei evangelizet.

15. Pro huiusmodi duplicis examinis exitu, poterit Ordinarius candidatum declarare idoneum aut generatim aut pro aliqua solummodo praedicationis specie, ad tempus vel ad experimentum et certis sub conditionibus, aut absolute et non in perpetuum, dando illi *pagellam* praedicationis, ea omnino ratione qua datur pro confessionibus, vel ei facultatem praedicandi simpliciter denegando.

16. Non prohibentur tamen Ordinarii, in casibus particularibus et per exceptionem, quominus aliquem ad praedicandum, sine praevio examine de quo supra, admittant, dummodo aliis iisque certis argumentis de eius idoneitate constet.

17. Vetitum tamen absolute esto *diplomata*, ut aiunt, *praedicationis* subditis etiam propriis impertiri, vel subditis etiam propriis sed honoris titulo aut in aestimationis signum.

18. Servata, pro regularibus et religiosis exemptis, eorum Ordinariis facultate deputandi subditos, quos secundum regulas et constitutiones Ordinis noverint dignos et idoneos, conformiter tamen semper ad praescriptiones Codicis, can. 1338, ad praedicandum intra septa domus religiosae vel monasterii; si tamen destinare aliquem voluerint ad conciones habendas in publicis ecclesiis, *non exclusis Ordinis propriis*, tenentur illum coram dioecesano loci Ordinario sistere ad examen subeundum iuxta superius disposita articulis 13, 14, 15.

CAPUT III

Quid in sacra praedicatione servandum sit vel vitandum

19. Quoniam *sancta sancte tractanda sunt*, nemo praedicationem suscipiat quin digne ac proxime se praeparaverit studio simul et oratione.

20. Argumenta concionum sint essentialiter sacra (Cod. can. 1347). Quod si concionator alia argumenta tractare voluerit non stricte sacra,

semper tamen domui Dei convenientia, facultatem a loci Ordinario petere et obtinere debebit; qui quidem Ordinarius eam numquam concedet nisi re mature considerata eiusque necessitate perspecta. Concionatoribus tamen omnibus de re politica in ecclesiis agere omnino et absolute sit vetitum.

21. Elogia funebria nemini recitare fas esto nisi praevio et explicito consensu Ordinarii, qui quidem, antequam consensum praebet, poterit etiam exigere ut sibi manuscriptum exhibeatur.

22. Concionator prae oculis semper habeat et in praxim deducat quae S. Hieronymus Nepotiano commendabat: *Divinas Scripturas saepius lege: imo nunquam de manibus tuis sacra lectio deponatur. . . Sermo presbyteri Scripturarum lectione conditus sit.* Studio autem Scripturarum sacrarum iungatur studium Patrum ac Doctorum Ecclesiae.

23. Citationes ac testimonia scriptorum aut auctorum prophanorum sobrietate summa adhibeantur, multoque magis dicta haereticorum, apostatarum et infidelium: numquam vero personarum viventium auctoritates proferantur. Fides et christiana morum honestas non his egent adsertoribus ac defensoribus.

24. Concionator ne plausus auditorum aucupetur, sed quaerat unice animarum salutem et commendationem a Deo atque Ecclesia. *Docente te in ecclesia non clamor populi, sed gemitus suscitetur. Lacrymae auditorum laudes tuae sint* (Hieron. ad Nepotian.).

25. Usus, qui alicubi invaluit, ephemerides vel plagulas typis impressas adhibendi tum ad auditores aucupandus ante praedicationem, tum post praedicationem ad concionatoris meritum extollendum, reprobandus omnino est et damnandus, quovis id praetextu boni fiat. Curent Ordinarii, quantum poterint, ut ne id usuveniat.

26. Quoad actionem in concionando nil melius praescribi potest quam quod S. Hieronymus Nepotianum admonebat: *Nolo te declamatorem et rabulam garrulumque sine ratione, sed mysteriorum peritum et sacramentorum Dei eruditissimum. Verba volvere, et celeritate dicendi apud imperitum vulgus admirationem sui facere, indoctorem hominum est. . . Nihil tam facile quam vilem plebeculam et indoctam concionem linguae volubilitate decipere, quae quidquid non intelligit plus miratur.*

27. Quamobrem concionator tam in ratiocinatione quam in linguae usu sese communi auditorum captui accomodet; quoad vero actionem ac recitationem, eam observet modestiam et gravitatem, quae illi convenit qui pro Christo legatione fungitur.

28. Caveat item semper ac diligentissime ne sacram praedicationem in quaestum vertat, quaerendo quae sua sunt, non quae Iesu Christi; ne sit igitur *turpis lucri cupidus* nec vanae gloriolae lenocinio se capi sinat.

Nunquam vero ex animo permittat excidere quod, secundum Evangelii et Apostolorum doctrinam et Sanctorum exempla, idem Hieronymus Nepotiano suggerebat: *Non confundant opera tua sermonem tuum; ne cum in ecclesia loqueris, tacitus quilibet respondeat: Cur ergo haec quae dicis, ipse non facis?—Delicatus magister est qui, pleno ventre, de ieiuniis loquitur. . . Sacerdotis os, mens manusque concordent.*

CAPUT IV

Cui et quomodo interdicens praedicatio

29. Concionatores, qui praescriptiones superiori capite editas neglegant, si emendationis spem praebeant et graviter non offenderint, prima alterave vice ab Episcopo moneantur ac reprehendantur.

30. Si vero emendationem neglexerint aut graviter cum fidelium scandalo peccaverint, Episcopus, ad tramitem Codicis, can. 1340, §§ 2 et 3.

(a) si agatur de proprio subdito aut de religioso cui praedicandi facultatem ipse dederit, concessam facultatem, nullo hominum respectu, aut ad tempus revocet aut omnino abroget;

(b) si autem de sacerdote extradioecetano agatur vel de religioso cui non ipse *pagellam* impertiverit, praedicationem illi in dioecesi sua interdicat simulque de re moneat tam Ordinarium proprium quam eum qui *praedicationis pagellam* eidem concessit; in casibus autem gravioribus ne omittat ad S. Sedem referre;

(c) poterit etiam Episcopus, imo et debet pro diversitate casuum, concionatore graviter peccante, coeptam praedicationem ipsi intercipere.

31. Interdici pariter praedicatione oportet, *saltem ad tempus et pro aliquo loco*, quicumque aut pro sua vivendi ratione aut quavis alia de causa, etsi inculpabiliter, publicam bonam existimationem amiserit, ita ut ministerium suum inutile vel damnosum evaserit.

32. Ordinarii dioecesani commissionem vigilantiae pro praedicatione, unusquisque in sua dioecesi, instituent, quae iisdem sacerdotibus componi poterit ac commissio pro examine candidatorum.

33. Quia vero nec Episcopi nec commissio vigilantiae adesse ubique in dioecesi poterunt; quum agetur de praedicationibus maioris momenti in locis dissitis, Ordinarii exigent his desuper a Vicariis Foraneis vel a parochis informationes peculiares et tutas iuxta normas superius traditas.

CAPUT V

De praeparatione remota ad ministerium praedicationis

34. Ordinarii et Superiores religiosorum stricte obligantur proprios clericos ad sanctam salutaremque praedicationem ab ipsa iuvenili aetate formare studiorum tempore, tum ante tum post susceptum sacerdotium.

35. Curabunt igitur ut dicti clerici, dum sacrae theologiae dant operam, de variis praedicationum generibus doceantur; praeque manibus habeant et gustent exemplaria insignia quae in omni concionum genere Sancti Patres reliquerunt, praeter illa quae in sacris Evangeliiis, in Actibus et Epistolis Apostolorum ubique accesserunt.

36. Studebunt item Ordinarii ut iuvenes instituantur de actione et pronuntiatione in concionibus servandis, ut eam deinde gravitatem, simplicitatem et concinnitatem praeseferant, quae nihil histrionem sapiat, sed verbo Dei conveniat, probetque concionantem pro animi persuasione et ex corde loqui sublimemque spectare finem, qui ministerio suo est praestitutus.

37. Haec dum in seminariis vel studiorum locis peragentur, Superiores

scrutabuntur quod genus praedicationis singulorum alumnorum dispositioni magis respondeat, ut deinde ea super re ad Ordinarium referant.

38. Initialem autem institutionem, quam clerici in seminariis vel in studiorum domibus habuerunt, Ordinarii, etiam post sacros Ordines susceptos, perficiendam curabunt.

39. Quamobrem, iuxta informationes de unoquoque habitas, eos facilioribus primum ac humilioribus praedicationibus occupabunt et exercebunt, ut in tradenda pueris christiana catechesi, Evangelio breviter explicando, iisque similibus.

40. Poterunt demum Ordinarii suis clericis praescribere ut, aliquo annorum spatio, examen de praedicatione in curia quotannis subeant tam voce quam scripto, ea quidem methodo quae ipsis magis probabitur, conformiter scilicet ad praescriptiones Codices pro examiniibus annuis a clericis subeundis post sacerdotii susceptionem.

Ex S. C. Consistoriali die 28 iunii, in pervigilio SS. App. Petri et Pauli anno 1917.

✠ C. CARD. DE LAI, Ep. Sabinae., *Secretarius*.

✠ V. SARDI, Archiep. Caesariensis., *Adessor*.

L. ✠ S.

THE TEACHING AND EXPLANATION OF THE NEW CODE OF CANON LAW

(August 7, 1917)

[The new Code of Canon Law comes into force in the whole of the Latin Church on Pentecost Sunday, 1918.]

S. CONGREGATIO DE SEMINARIIS ET DE STUDIORUM UNIVERSITATIBUS DE NOVO IURIS CANONICI CODICE IN SCHOLIS PROPONENDO

Cum novum iuris canonici Codicem SS. D. N. Benedictus Pp. XV a die festo Pentecostes proximi anni millesimi nongentesimi duodevicesimi in universa latina Ecclesia vim habiturum esse edixerit, liquet ex eo ipso die Codicem fore authenticum et unicum iuris canonici fontem proptereaque tum in disciplina Ecclesiae moderanda, tum in iudiciis et in scholis eo uno utendum esse. Quam sit igitur necessarium, clericis praesertim, Codicem probe nosse atque omnino habere perspectum, nemo est qui non videat.

Itaque Sacra haec Congregatio, ut in re tanti momenti rectae alumnorum institutioni pro officio suo consulat, omnibus ac singulis studiorum Universitatibus et iuris canonici Lyceis quae, ad normam can. 256, § 1, eidem Sacrae Congregationi parent, praecipit ac mandat, ut in schola antehac *textus* aptissime nuncupata, in qua ius canonicum penitus copioseque praelegitur, ita in posterum eiusmodi disciplina tradatur, ut alumni, non modo Codicis sententia *synthetice* proposita, sed accurata quoque uniuscuiusque canonis *analysisi*, ad cognoscendum et intelligendum Codicem veluti manu ducantur: debent scilicet doctores iuri canonico tradendo, ipso Codicis ordine ac titulorum capitumque serie religiosissime servata, singulos canones diligenti explanatione interpretari. Iidem

tamen magistri, ante quam dicere de aliquo instituto iuridico aggre-
diantur, apte exponant qui eius fuerit ortus, quae decursu temporis
acciderint progressionones, mutationes ac vices, ut discipuli plenorem iuris
cognitionem assequantur.

Nullo ceterum, praeter Codicem, libro alumnos uti necesse erit ;
quodsi doctoribus placuerit eos unum aliquem adhibere librum, id sancte
retinendum, ut non eius libri ordini ordo Codicis, sed huic ille aptetur
et accommodetur.

Romae, ex aedibus S. Congregationis de Seminariis et Studiorum
Universitatibus, die VII mensis augusti anni MCMXVII.

CAIETANUS CARD. BISLETI, *Praefectus*.

IOSEPH ROSSINO, *Substitutus*.

L. ✠ S.

CERTAIN CANONS OF THE NEW CODE TO TAKE EFFECT IMMEDIATELY

(August 20, 1917)

[These canons are in force from the date of issue of this decree,
viz., August 20, 1917.]

ACTA OFFICIORUM SECRETARIA STATUS

DE PRAESCRIPTIS ALIQUORUM CODICIS CANONUM

Episcopi aliive locorum Ordinarii complures a SS. D. N. Benedicto
Pp. XV demisse efflagitarunt ut, nulla interposita mora, vigere incipiant
praescripta Codicis i.e. quae sequuntur :

- 1° Canonis 859, § 2 ;
- 2° Canonis 1108, § 3 ;
- 3° Canonis 1247, § 1 ;
- 4° Canonum 1250, 1251, 1252, 1253, 1254.

Beatissimus Pater, in audientia die 19 mensis augusti infrascripto
Cardinali data, relatas preces benigne excipiens, decrevit, praescripta
canonum, de quibus supra, ex hoc ipso die vim habere ; praetereaque,
Motu proprio, concessit ut S. R. E. Cardinales iam nunc omnibus ac
singulis fruantur privilegiis quae can. 239, § 1, 240, 600, n. 3, 1189, 1401,
eiusdem Codicis describuntur. Quae omnia promulgari iussit, contrariis
quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

Ex aedibus Vaticanis die 20 mensis augusti anni 1917.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status*.

[For convenience of reference we give underneath the several pre-
scriptions mentioned in the above decree.]

CAN. 859.

§ 2. Paschalis communio fiat a dominica Palmarum ad dominicam
in albis, sed locorum Ordinariis fas est, si ita personarum ac locorum

adjuncta exigant, hoc tempus etiam pro omnibus suis fidelibus anticipare, non tamen ante quartam diem dominicam Quadragesimae, vel prorogare, non tamen ultra festum sanctissimae Trinitatis.

CAN. 1108.

§ 3. Ordinarii tamen locorum possunt, salvis legibus liturgicis, etiam praedictis temporibus eam (benedictionem nuptialem solemnem) permittere ex justa causa, monitis sponsis ut a nimia pompa abstineant.

CAN. 1247.

§ 1. Dies festi sub praecepto in universa Ecclesia sunt tantum; Omnes et singuli dies dominici, festa Nativitatis, Circumcisionis, Epiphaniae, Ascensionis et sanctissimi Corporis Christi, Immaculatae Conceptionis et Assumptionis Almae Genetricis Dei Mariae, sancti Joseph ejus sponsi, Beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum, Omnium denique Sanctorum.

CAN. 1250.

Abstinentiae lex vetat carne jureque ex carne vesci, non autem ovis, lacticiis et quibuslibet condimentis etiam ex adipe animalium.

CAN. 1251.

§ 1. Lex jejunii praescribit ut nonnisi unica per diem comestio fiat; sed non vetat aliquid cibi mane et vespere sumere, servata tamen circa ciborum quantitatem et qualitatem probata locorum consuetudine.

§ 2. Nec vetitum est carnes ac pisces in eadem refectioe permiscere; nec serotinam refectionem cum prandio permutare.

CAN. 1252.

§ 1. Lex solius abstinentiae servanda est singulis sextis feriis.

§ 2. Lex abstinentiae simul et jejunii servanda est feria quarta Cinerum, feriis sextis et sabbatis Quadragesimae et feriis Quatuor Temporum, pervigiis Pentecostes, Deiparae in coelum assumptae, Omnium Sanctorum et Nativitatis Domini.

§ 3. Lex solius jejunii servanda est reliquis omnibus Quadragesimae diebus.

§ 4. Diebus dominicis vel festis de praecepto lex abstinentiae, vel abstinentiae et jejunii, vel jejunii tantum cessat, nec pervigia anticipantur; item cessat Sabbato Sancto post meridiem.

CAN. 1253.

His canonibus nihil immutatur de indultis particularibus, de votis cujuslibet personae physicae vel moralis, de constitutionibus ac regulis cujusvis religionis vel instituti approbati sive virorum sive mulierum in communi viventium etiam sine votis.

CAN. 1254.

§ 1. Abstinentiae lege tenentur omnes qui septimum aetatis annum expleverint.

§ 2. Lege jejunii adstringuntur omnes ab expleto vicesimo primo aetatis anno ad inceptum sexagesimum.

CAN. 239.

§ 1. Praeter alia privilegia quae in hoc Codice suis in titulis enumerantur, Cardinales omnes a sua promotione in Consistorio facultate gaudent:

1°. Audiendi ubique terrarum confessiones etiam religiosorum utriusque sexus et absolvendi ab omnibus peccatis et censuris etiam reservatis, exceptis tantum censuris Sedi Apostolicae specialissimo modo reservatis et illis quae adnexae sunt revelationi secreti S. Officii;

2°. Sibi suisque familiaribus eligendi sacerdotem confessionibus excipiendis, qui, si iurisdictione careat, eam ipso iure obtinet, etiam quod spectat ad peccata et censuras, reservatas quoque, illis tantum censuris exceptis, de quibus in n. 1;

3°. Verbum Dei ubique praedicandi;

4°. Celebrandi vel alii permittendi ut coram se celebret unam Missam in feria V maioris hebdomadae ac tres Missas in nocte Nativitatis Domini;

5°. Benedicendi ubique, solo crucis signo, cum omnibus indulgentiis a Sancta Sede concedi solitis, rosaria, aliasque coronas precatorias, cruces, numismata, statuas, scapularia a Sede Apostolica probata eaque imponendi sine onere inscriptionis;

6°. Sub unica benedictione erigendi, in ecclesiis et oratoriis etiam privatis aliisque piis locis, stationes *Viae Crucis* cum omnibus indulgentiis, quae huiusmodi pium exercitium peragentibus impertitae sunt; nec non benedicendi pro fidelibus, qui causa infirmitatis vel alius legitimi impedimenti sacras stationes *Viae Crucis* visitare nequeant, Crucifixi icones cum applicatione omnium indulgentiarum devoto exercitio eiusdem *Viae Crucis* a Romanis Pontificibus adnexarum;

7°. Celebrandi super aram portatilem non solum in domo propriae habitationis, sed ubicunque degunt; et permittendi ut alia Missa, ipsis adstantibus, celebretur;

8°. Celebrandi in mari, debitis cautelis adhibitis;

9°. In omnibus ecclesiis et oratoriis Missam celebrandi proprio calendario conformem;

10°. Fruendi altari privilegiato personali quotidiano;

11°. Lucrandi in propriis sacellis indulgentias, ad quas acquirendas praescripta sit visitatio templi alicuius vel publicae aediculae civitatis seu loci, in quo Cardinales actu commorentur, quo privilegio etiam eorum familiares frui possunt;

12°. Benedicendi ubique populo more Episcoporum; sed in Urbe in ecclesiis tantum, piis locis et fidelium consessibus;

13°. More Episcoporum gestandi crucem ante pectus etiam supra mozetam atque utendi mitra et baculo pastorali;

14°. Sacrum celebrandi in quolibet privato sacello sine praeiudicio illius qui indulto gaudet;

15°. Pontificalia cum throno et baldachino peragendi in omnibus ecclesiis extra Urbem, Ordinario praemonito, si ecclesia sit cathedralis;

16°. Honoribus locorum Ordinariis tribui solitis fruendi quocumque se conferant;

17°. Fidem faciendi in foro externo, de oraculo pontificio tesantes;

18°. Fruendi sacello ab Ordinarii visitatione exempto;

19°. De redditibus beneficiariis libere disponendi etiam per testamentum, salvo praescripto can. 1298;

20°. Consecrationes et benedictiones ecclesiarum, altarium, sacrae suppellectilis, Abbatum aliasve similes, excepta oleorum sacrorum consecratione, si Cardinalis caractere episcopali careat, ubique locorum, servatis servandis, peragendi, firmo praescripto can. 1157;

21°. Praecedendi omnibus Praelatis etiam Patriarchis, imo ipsis Legatis Pontificiis, nisi Legatus sit Cardinalis in proprio territorio residens; Cardinalis autem Legatus a latere praecedat extra Urbem omnibus aliis;

22°. Conferendi primam tonsuram et ordines minores, dummodo promovendus habeat dimissorias proprii Ordinarii litteras;

23°. Ministrandi sacramentum confirmationis, firmo onere inscriptionis nominis confirmati ad normam iuris;

24°. Concedendi indulgentias ducentorum dierum, etiam toties quoties lucrandas, in locis vel institutis ac pro personis suae iurisdictionis vel protectionis; item in aliis locis, sed a praesentibus solummodo, singulis vicibus, lucrandas.

§ 2. Cardinalis Decanus gaudet privilegio ordinandi et consecrandi electum Pontificem, si hic ordinatione vel episcopali consecratione indigeat, et tunc pallio utitur; quod privilegium, absente Cardinali Decano, competit Subdecano, eoque etiam absente, antiquiori Cardinali Episcopo suburbicario.

§ 3. Demum Cardinalis Proto-diaconus pallia Archiepiscopis et Episcopis privilegio fruentibus eorumve procuratoribus, vice Romani Pontificis, imponit; et nomen novi electi Pontificis populo annuntiat.

CAN. 240.

§ 1. Cardinalis ad sedem suburbicariam promotus et in eiusdem possessionem canonice immissus est verus Episcopus suae dioecesis, eaque potestate in eam pollet, quam Episcopi residentiales in propria dioecesi obtinent.

§ 2. Ceteri Cardinales in suis titulis vel diaconiis, postquam eorundem canonicam possessionem ceperint, omnia possunt quae locorum Ordinarii in suis ecclesiis, exceptis ordine iudiciorum et qualibet iurisdictione in fideles, sed salva potestate in iis quae ad disciplinam, morum correctionem, servitium ecclesiae pertinent.

§ 3. Cum throno et baldachino Cardinalis ordinis presbyteralis potest in suo titulo pontificalia peragere et Cardinalis ordinis diaconalis in sua diaconia pontificaliter assistere et nemo alius ibidem id potest sine Cardinalis assensu; in aliis vero Urbis ecclesiis Cardinales throno et baldachino uti nequeunt sine licentia Romani Pontificis.

CAN. 600.

3°. Possunt clausuram ingredi qui supremum actu tenent populorum principatum eorumque uxores cum comitatu; itemque S. R. E. Cardinales;

CAN. 1189.

Oratoria S. R. E. Cardinalium et Episcoporum sive residentialium sive titularium, licet privata, fruuntur tamen omnibus iuribus et privilegiis quibus oratoria semi-publica gaudent.

CAN. 1401.

S. R. E. Cardinales, Episcopi, etiam titulares, aliique Ordinarii, necessariis adhibitis cautelis, ecclesiastica librorum prohibitionem non adstringuntur.

THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY OF IRELAND IS GRANTED
MANY INDULGENCES AND PRIVILEGES

(April 12, 1917)

[1. *Indulgences* : (a) Plenary (1) on the first day of enrolment in the Society to all who, having devoutly confessed and received Holy Communion, shall visit the proper church of the Society, if there be such, or otherwise, any church or public oratory, and there offer prayers to God for concord amongst Christian princes, for the extirpation of heresy, for the conversion of sinners and for the exaltation of Holy Church ; (2) to all members of the Society who, at the moment of death, having confessed and received Holy Communion, or if they are unable to do that, having invoked the name of Jesus orally, if they can do so, or at least devoutly in their hearts, shall accept death resignedly as the wages of sin ; (3) to all members of the Society who, having confessed and received Holy Communion, shall visit the church of the Society, if there be such, or otherwise any church or public oratory, and there offer prayers for the above intentions, on the Feasts of the Holy Trinity, of the Immaculate Conception, of St. Patrick, of St. Laurence O'Toole (November 14), and of St. Brigid, or on the Sundays immediately following those Feasts,—a plenary indulgence and remission of all their sins on each occasion. (b) Partial : (1) An indulgence of 300 days on any day of the year to all members who devoutly recite the following antiphon, versicle, response, and prayer : *Ant.* 'Come, Holy Spirit, fill the hearts of Thy faithful and enkindle in them the fire of Thy love. *V.* Send forth Thy Spirit and they shall be created. *R.* And Thou shalt renew the face of the earth. *Prayer.* We beseech Thee, O Lord, that the Paraclete, who proceedeth from Thee, may enlighten our minds and lead us, as Thy Son hath promised, into all truth ; who liveth and reigneth with Thee, in the unity of the same Holy Spirit, God, for ever and ever, Amen.' A similar indulgence as often as they devoutly visit the Blessed Sacrament and there pray for the welfare of the Society ; (2) an indulgence of 100 days on any day that they, offering a doxology or *Gloria Patri*, co-operate with the Society in the diffusion of Catholic truth. All these indulgences are applicable to the Holy Souls, except the plenary indulgence obtainable at the moment of death.

2. *Privileges* : To priests who are members of the Society are granted special faculties of blessing with a Sign of the Cross, Rosaries, Crosses, Crucifixes, etc., and the privilege of Altar under certain conditions.

The decree, though dated April 12, was not published until July 2.]

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE

SODALITATI VERITATIS CATHOLICAE IN HIBERNIA CONSTITUTAE
INDULGENTIAE ET PRIVILEGIA IN PERPETUUM CONCEDUNTUR

BENEDICTUS PP. XV

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Beati Petri Apostolorum Principis vices hic in terris, nullis quidem meritis Nostris, gerentibus divinitus, antiquius nihil est Nobis, quam ut piae Societates, quae militantis Ecclesiae

ministros, quasi auxiliares cohortes, in bono certamine decertando adiuvant, peculiaribus ornentur privilegiis et spiritualibus gratiis, quibus auctae uberiores in Domino incrementa suscipere satagant. Hoc ducti consilio, cum Ven. Frater Ioannes Harty, Episcopus Cassiliensis et Praeses 'Veritatis Catholicae Societatis Hiberniae' frugiferum ad finem sexdecim iam ab annis institutae, sub auspicio Episcopatus Hibernici, ut in vulgus modico pretio effundantur per typos edita salutaria ac pia scripta, enixis Nos precibus flagitaverit, ut nonnullis Societatem ipsam indulgentiis locupletare dignemur, Nos optatis his annuendum, quantum in Domino possumus, censuimus. Quae cum ita sint, audito dilecto filio Nostro S. R. E. Cardinali Poenitentiario Maiore, de omnipotentis Dei misericordia ac BB. Petri et Pauli Apostolorum Eius auctoritate confisi, omnibus et singulis fidelibus qui Societatem memoratam Veritatis Catholicae in Hibernia in posterum ingredientur, die primo eorum inscriptionis, si vere poenitentes et confessi ac S. Communione refecti, in propria Societatis Ecclesia, si adsit, secus in quavis alia publica Aede sive Sacello item publico, pro Christianorum Principum concordia, haeresum extirpatione, peccatorum conversione ac S. Matris Ecclesiae exaltatione pias ad Deum preces effundant, plenariam; ac tam inscriptis, quam in posterum eadem in Societate inscribendis fidelibus, in cuiuslibet eorum mortis articulo, si admissorum Sacramentali exomologesi expiati atque Angelorum dapibus refecti, vel, quatenus id facere nequiverint nomen Iesu ore, si potuerint, sin minus corde devote invocaverint, mortemque tamquam peccati stipendium submisso animo receperint, etiam plenariam; tandem similiter omnibus et singulis nunc et in posterum existentibus enunciatae Societatis sodalibus, qui singulis annis Dominica SS^{mae} Trinitatis, nempe post Pentecosten prima, et festivitatis Immaculatae Conceptionis B. Mariae Virginis, idest die octava mensis decembris, die S. Patricii, nempe die martii decimoseptimo, S. Laurentii O'Toole, scilicet quarto decimo novembris mensis die, denique S. Birgittae, nimirum Kalendis februariis, aut Dominicis immediate respective festivitates ipsas sequentibus, a medietate diei praecedentis ad mediam usque noctem diei festi, propriam item si reperiatur, Ecclesiam Societatis, secus quodvis aliud templum sive sacellum publicum, similiter poenitentes et confessi atque ecclesiastica mensa recreati celebrent, ibique preces, uti superius diximus, fundant, quo ex his die id agant, plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam et remissionem misericorditer in Domino concedimus. Insuper dictis fidelibus nunc et in posterum in Societate Catholicae Veritatis existentibus, quo per annum die, contrito saltem corde, recitaverint antiphonam, versiculum, responsum et orationem ut infra: 'Veni, Sancte Spiritus, reple tuorum corda fidelium et tui amoris in eis ignem accende.—Emitte Spiritum tuum et creabuntur, et renovabis faciem terrae.—Oremus. Mentis nostras, quaesumus, Domine, Paraclitus, qui a Te praecedit, illuminet, et inducat in omnem, sicut tuus promisit Filius, veritatem. Qui Tecum vivit et regnat in unitate eiusdem Spiritus Sancti Deus in saecula saeculorum. Amen'; et quoties contrito pariter corde SS^{mu}m Eucharistiae Sacramentum visitent et coram Ipso pro incremento et iuxta fines Veritatis Catholicae

Societatis Hiberniae devote orent, trecentos de numero penarium dies; quo vero die ad catholicarum veritatum diffusionem per eandem Societatem cooperentur, doxologiam, sive 'Gloria Patri' semel recitantes, de numero pariter penarium dierum in forma Ecclesiae consueta centum expungimus. Porro largimur omnibus et singulis ipsis sociis, si malint, liceat (excepto iugiter in mortis articulo lucranda indulgentia) omnibus aliis tam plenariis quam partialibus indulgentiis functorum vita labes paenasque expiare. Praeterea tam adlectis in praesens, quam in posterum eandem in Catholicae Veritatis Hiberniae Societatem adlegendis Sacerdotibus, facultatem facimus benedicendi unico Crucis signo Coronas precatórias, Cruces, Crucifixos, parvasque ex metallo tum Redemptoris, tum Virginis, tum Sanctorum statuas, eisque applicandi indulgentias apostolicas omnes quae in elencho a Suprema Congregatione S. Officii die 5 septembris anno 1914 edito numerantur; pariterque veniam tribuimus benedicendi Crucifixos cum applicatione indulgentiarum quae a Via Crucis sive Calvariae adpellantur, et quas lucrari poterunt sodales qui legitime impediti quominus ante Stationes legitime erectas se sistant, Crucifixum ipsum manu gerentes, bis decies Orationem Dominicam, Salutationem Angelicam ac doxologiam sive 'Gloria Patri' devote recitent. Fas etiam sit Sacerdotibus iam inscriptis quam in posterum dicta in Societate inscribendis bis in hebdomada Missae, quam pro defunctis celebrent, altaris indulgentiam applicare. Tandem defunctorum ipsius Sodalitii Veritatis Catholicae sodalium animas in Purgatorii igne detentas adiuvaré cupientes, concedimus atque indulgemus, ut Missae omnis quae ad quodvis cuiuslibet Ecclesiae Altare pro anima cuiuscumque sodalis dictae Societatis, quae Deo in charitate coniuncta ab hac luce migraverit, per quemvis Sacerdotem adprobatum saecularem, seu, de Superiorum suorum licentia, regularem, rite celebrabuntur, animae pro qua litatae fuerint perinde suffragentur, ac si ad privilegiatum Altare fuissent peractae. Non obstantibus Nostra et Cancellariae Apostolicae regula de non concedendis indulgentiis ad instar aliisque Constitutionibus et Sanctionibus Apostolicis ceterisque omnibus in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque. Praesentibus perpetuis futuris temporibus valituris. Volumus autem, ut praesentium Litterarum transumptis, seu exemplis, etiam impressis, manu alicuius Notarii publici subscriptis ac sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae muniti, eadem prorsus fides adhibeatur, quae adhiberetur ipsis praesentibus si forent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die XII aprilis MCMXVII, Pontificatus Nostri anno tertio.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status.*

REVIEWS AND NOTES

SCIENCE ET APOLOGÉTIQUE. Par A. de Lapparent. Paris : Bloud et Gay.

THE output of popular French studies of Philosophy and Religious Critique is truly wonderful. From a Catholic point of view they satisfy a real want. Unfortunately, in France, on account of the separation of Philosophy from Science in the Universities, it is rarely one meets with a philosophical work in which scientific knowledge is a bit more modern than the *Discours de la Methode*. M. de Lapparent in his lectures (contained in the volume before us) on Apologetics before the Catholic Institute of Paris combines the rôle of a philosopher and a scientist. He is admirably qualified for his task, as his experience in scientific teaching reaches over a period of thirty years. His desire is to bring comfort to men of good will, to strengthen them in their religious convictions, and to prevent them from falling into an excess which would consist in discrediting Science under the pretext that it has been so often intemperately used. 'Le domaine des sciences dites exactes tend chaque jour à s'accroître, la forme mathématique étant nécessairement celle à laquelle aspire toute branche de nos connaissances parvenue à un suffisant degré de développement. . . . Des lors le caractère d'infailibilité et de nécessité primordiale qu'on attribue à ces règles rejaillit bien vite sur les choses qu'elles semblent gouverner; de sorte que, de plus en plus, la notion d'une Toute-Puissance, distincte de l'Univers créé, risque d'être jugée superflue.' It is necessary then, to examine more closely the basis of the privilege of superior necessity which some people seem to recognize in Mathematics. In a very technical but interesting chapter on the notions of Geometry he shows that although the 'certitude empirique (of the rules of Euclid) est hors de doute, cela ne vaut pas dire qu'elles soient logiquement nécessaires, au point qu'elles s'imposeraient même à la Toute-Puissance créatrice; car nous allons voir que de simples mortels ont pu légitimement s'en affranchir.' This was brought about by Lobatcheffsky who, at the end of the nineteenth century, seeing that the postulate of parallel lines was indemonstrable, asked himself the question as to what would happen if, rejecting this principle of parallel lines, he at the same time admitted all the other axioms of Euclid. So he invented *Pangeometry*, in which he has been able to avoid every contradiction at all offensive to Logic. The characteristic of this geometry is that the sum of three angles of a triangle is always less than two right angles, whilst in Euclid's geometry it is invariably equal to two right angles. A little later Riemann invented his *Metageometry* in which the sum of the angles of a triangle is greater than two right angles. Euclid's

geometry had the *plane* for its groundwork, the other geometries say that the *sphere* (the earth is a sphere) is the *real* groundwork, and instead of straight lines we have arcs, either concave or convex, and if we describe a triangle on a sphere with concave or convex arcs we shall have the three angles either greater or less than two right angles. The idea is a novel one, and it goes to show the fallibility of accepted notions of Science. 'Celui qui a créé les corps et les esprits a donc donné à cette géométrie (Euclid) sa raison d'être. Mais ces décisions ne s'imposaient pas à lui comme les seules nécessaires, et les choses auraient pu être réglées de telle façon qu'une géométrie différente, quoique non moins logique, ait sortir de l'interprétation scientifique des phénomènes.'

The same instability of principles is evident in the science of Mechanics. 'Là où les Lagrange et les Leplace trouvaient toutes choses simples, nous reconstruisons aujourd'hui les plus sérieuses difficultés . . . les expositions plus ou moins traditionnelles des principes sont incohérentes.' The cause of this is the dualism between energy and matter. Hertz, the inventor of the electric waves that wireless telegraphy has popularized, does not hesitate to ask if the principles of Mechanics be rigorously true. 'Ce qui nous paraît ici scientifiquement contestable, c'est la distinction spécifique de la matière et du mouvement, comme si c'était chose toute naturelle de concevoir la première indépendamment du second. Mais une observation plus avancée a montré qu'au point de vue expérimental du moins, les deux notions de matière et de mouvement étaient inséparables.' The nearer we come to the ultimate elements of bodies the less legitimately can we speak of inertia. *Molecular mechanics*, then, is still in the making, and the science of *Energetics* becomes more necessary. Seeing, then, that, in the immense majority of cases, science cannot hope to reach the essence of things, 'doit-elle pour cela renoncer à l'espoir de s'en rapprocher de plus en plus ? Nous ne le croyons pas ; et notre conviction est, au contraire, qu'elle y marche par approximations successives, chaque progrès de l'hypothèse étant marqué par une conquête, dont le bénéfice est désormais acquis.' That is the only rational attitude to adopt towards science though faulty and indefinite be some of its principles and conclusions.

The chapter on 'Order in Creation' and the 'Principle of the Least Action' is very illuminating and arresting, and reveals the author's thorough acquaintance with chemistry and mineralogy. In the chapter on the 'Notions of Origin and of End,' 'Finality in the World,' he strikes a real controversial attitude to combat the doctrine expressed in the formula, 'no traces of a beginning, no prospects of an end,' and passes in review the sciences of astronomy, geology, and palaeontology, giving us some wonderfully interesting sidelights into various phases of these subjects.

The last chapter, on the 'Rights and Duties of the Apologist,' is a useful, well-reasoned exposition of a very important subject.

Ce n'est pas à la science même que l'apologiste aurait affaire ; c'est à ses représentants, ou du moins à ceux qui se disent tels . . . quand le vêtement qu'on nous offre est à ce point defectueux, nous sommes bien

fondés à préférer le nôtre. . . . C'est au nom de la science bien comprise que nous devons condamner leurs methodes, et c'est notre droit strict de leur demander un compte sévère des destructions qu'ils opèrent, quand leur impuissance est si manifeste à remplacer ce qu'ils suppriment. . . . Ce qu'on doit demander à l'apologetique, ce n'est pas de rendre la foi inutile; c'est de fournir les motifs du *rationabile obsequium*, sur lequel la vertu de foi doit être fondée. C'est ce que nous nous sommes efforcé de faire ici, en cherchant à établir l'esprit de la vraie science, pour la montrer partout imprégnée des notions d'ordre, de perfection, d'ideal et d'infini. . . . Plus leurs (les grands noms de la science, les Pascal, les Pasteur, etc.) connaissances s'étendaient et plus ils se sentaient envahis par un double sentiment; d'une part une admiration, pénétrée de gratitude, pour la beauté de l'œuvre dont les details se révélaient à eux; de l'autre une modestie croissante, motivée par la trop évidente disproportion du savoir présentement acquis avec l'immensité des problèmes que chaque découverte nouvelle fait inévitablement surgir.

Though extremely technical in some parts yet, written in such clear, graceful language, the book is delightful reading as well as being a scholarly work, useful to scientists and very helpful to all believers in revealed truth.

M. R.

THE STATIONS OF THE CROSS. Taken freely from the *Meditation on the Passion of Our Lord* by Richard Rolle. With cuts by Gabriel Pippet. London: Burns & Oates.

RICHARD ROLLE, born at Thornton, Yorkshire, about 1300, devoted himself as a hermit to a life of perfection. After his death his tomb was celebrated for miracles, and preparations for his canonization, including the composition of a Mass and Office in his honour, were made; but the cause was never prosecuted. His writings were extremely popular throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. He translated many parts of Sacred Scripture, but only his version of the Psalms has been printed. Many of his works on the spiritual life are now being reprinted, and a modernized version of his meditations on the Passion has been published by Mgr. Benson in a *Book of the Love of Jesus*. The present little book of the Stations of the Cross, taken from the *Meditations on the Passion*, neatly brought out, with quaint wood-cuts, and containing a beautiful translation of the *Stabat Mater*, forms a very pretty devotional treatise. The meditations and prayers, in their olden setting, are the outpourings of a tender and saintly soul, full of an intense love of Our Lady and her Son, and cannot but make our hearts throb in response to their vibrant piety.

M. R.

SPECIAL NOTICE

TO THE

CLERGY

We beg to request the Clergy who may require High-class stained glass windows, screens or screens, lamps, altar rails, pulpits and stained monumental and church furnishings, to write for designs and estimates.

The illustrations of this firm are especially artistic, elegant and distinctive.

WARLEY & CO.,

Camden Art Works

Camden Street, Dublin

Browne & Noble's

Special Publications

For Intermediate Examinations, 1918.

JUNIOR GRADE.

Junior Grade English. The Prescribed Course, 1917, 128 pp., cloth. With illustrations and additional material, designed for the Junior Grade, 1918, 128 pp., 1s. 6d.
Scott: The Tallman. Edited. 12 pp., 1s. 6d.

History of Rome. Specials revised and reset for use of Junior Grade and History Candidates by M. J. Morgan, B.A. 7s.

An Outline History of England and Ireland (Junior Grade Course), by M. J. Morgan, B.A. 1s. 6d.

Practical Account of English Literature. Adapted. 12 pp., 1s. 6d.

The New Model Arithmetic. By Isaac Newton and William Jones. Revised by H. Venn, Esq., M.A., and H. Andrews, Esq., M.A. 12 pp., 1s. 6d.

A New Practical Algebra. By George Gregory. 12 pp., 1s. 6d.

The Junior Grade Latin Intermediate Papers for various years (plain text) with full solutions, by an International Teacher. 1918, 1s. 6d.

MIDDLE GRADE.

The Middle Grade Poems and Drama. Complete Course, 1918, 128 pp., cloth. Edited and explained, with Introduction to the Study of Literature, Sketches of Poets and Poetasters, The Drama, and Suggestions Also to Composition.

Essays by Thackeray and Addison (as prescribed). With Introduction, Notes, etc. 1s. 6d.

O'Leary: Logarithm Map Cos. With Notes and Vocabulary. 12 pp., 1s. 6d.

A Poets of European History (1600-1800). By J. J. Harrison, M.A., Member of the Historical Association, London. 7s.

Greek Composition, Handbook of, with Exercises for Junior and Middle Grades. By Henry Drexler, B.A., M.A.; New College, Oxford; Professor of Greek, National University of Ireland. Ninth ed., revised and enlarged. 12s. 6d.

Latin Composition, Handbook of, with Exercises. By Henry Drexler, B.A., M.A.; New College, Oxford; Professor of Greek, N.U.I. 12s. 6d.

A Commercial Geography of Ireland. By Arthur M. Anderson, M.A., B.A., F.R.G.S., F.C.I.; Principal, Ballinacorney School of Commerce. With Maps and Illustrations. Second Edition. 1s. 6d.

SENIOR GRADE.

Macaulay's Lord Clive. Edited with Life, Notes, etc. 12s. 6d.

Macaulay: Eschtae Phaedrae Solentia. 12s. 6d.

Complete Catalogue sent free on application.

Browne & Noble, Ltd. 22, DUBLIN, BELFAR, CORK, WILMSTON.